

THE
**SOCIALIST
STANDARD**

JAN TO AUG

1922

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 209. VOL. 18.]

LONDON, JANUARY, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

WHY TAXES DO NOT CONCERN THE WORKERS.

One of the most effective election stunts with which capitalist agents have gulled the workers in recent years is, perhaps, Government extravagance. Not only against the Executive Government is the epithet "wasters" levelled, but against those in office on every district and urban council. County and borough council elections have, for years, been contested chiefly on this issue. Progressives and Labour candidates contended for reforms, more often than not proving that such reforms would benefit property owners, while the Moderates, or so-called Municipal Reformers, claimed that the ratepayers would be ruined or impoverished.

The anti-waste campaign being carried on to-day by a section of the Capitalist press is no different in essence from other campaigns directed against governments since the days of Pitt, or, to go far back into the past, the resistance of Roman and Grecian taxpayers to government extortion. Ancient and modern are alike, the protest of property owners against the payment of taxes levied on the property they own, for the purpose of making their ownership secure. Every property owner recognises the need for government, but general agreement between them ends there. Some argue that a government should confine its activities to the preservation of order within its territory and the prevention of aggression from abroad, thus keeping taxation at a minimum. Others believe that the government should not only do this, but should take cognisance of every social change, introduce reforms and legislation to meet the altered condi-

tions, and generally to supervise the whole field of industry in order to smooth over apparent crises and preserve the system against anarchy or revolution.

Between these two groups exist many shades of opinion; and sections of property owners are continually forming new parties around particular interests to obtain political control, in order to shift the burden of taxation from their own shoulders on to the shoulders of other property owners. The land owners, the kings of finance, the factory lords, the railway, mining and shipping magnates quarrel among themselves over the incidence of taxation, and the petty capitalists, led by "cheap money" cranks and others, quarrel with them all, though quite hopelessly. Their quarrel is hopeless because they are being slowly but surely squeezed out of industry by the big concerns. The financial monarchs control the Press and educate the voters to their point of view, the struggling petty capitalist whines about the bitter injustice, and tries to enlist the sympathy of the workers. But little capitalists are as much capitalists in essence as big ones. They are all property owners. All of them possess shares, big or small, in the land or other means of production, and if the workers side with the petty capitalists, placing in their hands the reins of power, the latter would merely use that power to improve their own position as far as possible, first by pushing taxation from their shoulders, secondly by endeavouring to hinder the growth of big businesses and combines, and thirdly by encouraging the smaller concerns.

It is easily seen from this that each section or party stands for its own interests; the thing that distinguishes them from each other is the nature or extent of their property. The fact that they own property, further, distinguishes them from the workers, who own none and, consequently, can have no interest in common with either section or party. Moreover, without workers to operate the machinery of production there could be no wealth for property owners to quarrel about, or from which taxes could be paid. The workers produce the wealth, the capitalists, big and little, own it between them, and with a portion of it maintain the necessary government forces to protect their ownership and enjoyment of the remainder.

In the days of Greece and Rome no one pretended that the slaves paid taxes, though they produced practically all the wealth of those societies. Why should the modern slave imagine that he does? Examine the worker's social status in the two epochs. The Roman slave was forced to work for the master who bought him, and in return was supplied with the necessities of life according to the standards of the time. The wage-slave is forced to work for the master who buys his labour-power at a price which seldom insures to him more than the bare necessities of life. The labour market is nearly always overstocked with the various forms of labour-power, with the result that competition for jobs is fierce and labour-power cheap. The tendency all the time is for wages to fall to the lowest level that will sustain life. The wealth produced by the Roman slave belonged to his master. The wealth produced by the wage-slave belongs to his masters. The Roman slave could not pay taxes because he had nothing to pay with. The wage-slave can only pay taxes if the amount of the tax is first added to his wages. In other words, if the necessities of life are taxed the same effect is produced as a rise in prices, and wages must be raised in order to preserve the standard of living. On the other hand, when prices fall for any reason whatsoever, wages are forced down by the masters. So much is the modern slaves' wages controlled by the rise and fall of prices that sliding scales have become general in many industries by which the workers' standard of living is evenly maintained by the adjustment of wages according to prices.

Thus in two widely separated epochs those

who produce the wealth of society possess all the characteristics of slavery in common. In each period they do not own property; are forced to work for a master and receive in return barely sufficient to enable them to live in accordance with prevailing standards and reproduce their kind. On the face of things it would seem preposterous to suggest that the workers in either period could be taxed. If anything was taken from the slave of antiquity he would deteriorate. If anything is taken from the modern worker his efficiency must suffer. The only way to make the worker a taxpayer is to give him more in wages than it costs him to live; but if this were done and the general height of wages raised for that purpose, it is quite obvious that the worker's position would not have been changed. In the same way, if the taxes imposed on the various articles consumed by the workers were taken off, prices and the cost of living would fall; the workers could live more cheaply and the price of their commodity, labour-power, would fall.

The fundamental difference between the workers of the two periods is that the chattel slave was himself a commodity to be bought and sold, while the wage-slave is assumed to be free, and the sole owner of his labour-power or energy. Given certain conditions such, for instance, as existed in the earliest days of capitalism, this difference would be of real benefit to the workers; but the development of capitalist industry makes it ever more difficult for the worker to sell his labour-power and, consequently, places him more completely at the mercy of the masters, both as regards his standard of living and his working conditions.

The modern worker is compelled to be more efficient and attentive to his work than the ancient. The conditions of the labour market make him more completely a slave, chain him more effectively to his task than any previous system of slavery has ever done. With all their physical aids to compulsion, the masters of Ancient Rome and Greece never had such slaves as the modern capitalist class have, yet the modern slave denies his slavery, because he is the sole owner of his energy. He forgets that he is compelled to sell it to some master, or masters, in order to live, and that when he does sell it he works at their bidding and for their profit while he remains in poverty.

Many well-meaning people complain bit-

terly of the injustice of taxing the necessities of life consumed by the workers. It is evident that they have not studied the situation, if our reasoning is correct. It is perfectly true that the workers are plundered, but not by taxation. It is true that the capitalist class, with all their agents and flunkies, live on the backs of the workers, but not by means of taxes extorted from them either directly or indirectly. The capitalists and their agents encourage the workers in the belief that they pay taxes for two reasons: to enlist their support in capitalist sectional and party squabbles and to hide from the workers the fact that they are enslaved and plundered in the workshops and factories.

There is one difference, however, between the ancient and modern slaves that, up till now, we have not taken into consideration. To-day the slave has a political status. He votes his masters, or their agents, into power. They in their turn are compelled to solicit his vote, to obtain his sanction to govern, because the workers are in a majority over the masters. This being the case, it is easy to see that once the workers realise that anti-waste candidates are capitalist candidates, seeking power for their own ends, and that questions of waste or taxation are purely capitalist questions; they can themselves organise and exercise their voting power purely in working-class interests as opposed to all sections and parties of the capitalist class.

This is the first step towards the emancipation of the working class and the establishment of a system of society where the means of wealth production will be owned in common and democratically controlled by the whole of the people. By educated, conscious and organised action the workers of the world will thus break up the last, most efficient, and brutal form of slavery that has ever flourished, and replace it with a system where production will be arranged according to the needs of all. Where no class will rule because classes will cease to exist, and where the producers of wealth will neither be chattels bought and sold nor the owners of labour-power which they must sell in order to live, but free men and women associating and organising to satisfy their needs with the least possible expenditure of effort, that they may have leisure for the enjoyment of a fuller life.

F. F.

THE "WORLD'S FAIR" OF POLITICS.

It is usual at this time of the year to see displayed on some of the hoardings large posters advertising the "World's Fair." This annual conglomeration of "freaks" and "side-shows" undoubtedly attracts quite a large number of members of the working class, who, anxious to forget for a few moments the wretched conditions of the factory, and also the unhealthy surroundings of their homes, part with a few of their hard-earned coppers to gain admission. Having seen the show, their superficial pleasure is ended; and they return once again to face the real facts of life under capitalism.

These facts are only too apparent to the Socialist, and consequently he becomes more keenly interested in something that happens all the year round; and for the purpose of analogy, we can call it the "World's Fair" of Politics; wherein the average member of the working class can have an endless variety of side-shows to distract his attention from the real cause of his poverty. Every performance is very effectively carried out by a host of "Political Jugglers," Christian "Fortune Tellers," and a troupe of Labour Tamers, who usually perform the celebrated "Red Herring" trick successfully.

After many months the great "Wizard" from Wales has accomplished the "Irish" trick, amidst great applause from the working class—and the "Red" element that we hear so much about are as "Green" as ever.

The Socialist remains cold; such incidents fail to move him from the task he set out to accomplish. That task is to distribute, wherever it is possible, the knowledge of Socialism that he possesses. So long as the workers continue to place political power in the hands of their masters, so long will capitalism remain. Whilst capitalism remains, the capitalists, only a small section of the community, own all the tools and instruments of wealth production, and the working class, which comprise the largest portion in Society, will be forced to sell the only thing that they possess—their labour power—to the capitalist class in order to get food, clothing and shelter.

Whether it be in the form of a "Washington Conflagration" or a "League of Take All," as the Socialist points out over and over again, they are no concern of the worker. Whilst capitalism continues the conditions of the working class must tend to grow worse.

Therefore, we urge upon all members of the working class to take advantage of the knowledge distributed by the Socialist Party of Great Britain, become organised into its ranks, and help to bring nearer the day when Socialism will become possible.

A. SPRATT.

JOTTINGS.

It was calculated that Christmas found us with between 6 and 7 millions within the circle of unemployment. Over three million pounds a week are being expended in some form of relief or other.

There appears to be a great diversity of opinion regarding the adequacy of the amount of relief paid. Some believe, and say, the workless are not getting enough. Others believe, and say, they are getting too much. Many people who happen for the time being to be enjoying a comparatively comfortable standard of life, object to the reiteration by the Socialist of the ugly facts of life, saying that, after all, it is only a difference in the point of view.

They mean that if the Socialist would only keep his mouth shut, things would go along much more quietly. The "poor" would be much more content if left alone. But it is not in accord with the principles of a Socialist to go about with his eyes and mouth shut. He is not going to be quiet about anything that affects the existence of the class to which he belongs. The "poor" don't make half the noise they ought to. But it is something more than that, even. The Socialist presents facts, and interprets those facts by the application of a scientific method. When this is done, it is not a question of a point of view at all, but the acceptance of proved testimony. If those facts are of a damaging nature to some people, they will reject them and conveniently adopt a "point of view."

But this so-called point of view itself is determined largely by the economic conditions under which the individual happens to be living. The question of relative security,

for instance. Whilst hunger and poverty of themselves will not make a person into a Socialist, they will yet enable him to distinguish between what might be termed a good time and a rotten one.

Everything is relative—we should go into ecstasies if we were suddenly rewarded with another ten shillings a week, believing we could work wonders with it. And so the Governor of South Australia is resigning his job because he finds his wage of £4,000 a year barely suffices to make ends meet.

o o o

If the assurances of our rulers and their working class supporters had been borne out we should now be living in a land abounding in plenty, and with nothing to mar our happiness. What is the actual state? Does it need describing? Is not every one of us familiar with it—to our sorrow? It is quite true that a great deal of the actual condition is purposely camouflaged so that the intense misery shall not be apparent.

The capitalists are suffering, too, some of them—not physically like we are, but from a shortage of trade. For trade means exploitation, and exploitation means profits.

Singularly enough, the only solution they can offer lies in a steady lowering of the standard of life and the restoration of a competitive selling capacity in the world's markets by a reduction in the price of labour-power.

o o o

One of the results of the capitalists' way of running the world is seen in the present plight of Brazil.

Brazil did not, of course, participate actively in the war, but is, nevertheless, as much a sufferer as anyone else. Indeed, this applies to most countries, whether they were belligerents or not. It shows that the capitalist system is interdependent; to be successful all its parts must work smoothly for the capitalist.

If any disturbance arises within the system, whether it be a financial crisis in peace time, or a war on a big scale, its effects are far-reaching.

The workers, being already poor, are the first to suffer: that is, their sufferings are increased—and they don't know why.

Primarily, in a system like the present, profits is the first and last thing that matters. It is the only precept the capitalist is guided by: sacred to him as furnishing the initiative which he is prone to regard as the driving force in a capitalist-ridden world.

Before the war Germany imported large quantities of coffee from Brazil. Brazil sold coffee to Germany, not because the Germans were fond of coffee, but because it was profitable to do so. Now, Germany is buying no coffee, not because she doesn't want it, but because she hasn't the money to pay for it, and leave the Brazilian planters and exporters with a profit. No profit—no coffee. Brazil retains the coffee, and is in consequence impoverished, with very little money wherewith to buy goods from other countries.

Clearly the lesson is shown: Abolish the system of production only for profits, with its basis of slavery and economic distress, and substitute one of production for use with universal security.

o o o

In associating itself with any measure in which the master class is interested, the Labour Party betrays the fact that it considers there are some points regarding the administration of capitalism which are mutually advantageous to workers and capitalists alike. An instance is the support given to the idea of disarmament. The Labour Party considers this to be a question on which organised labour should make itself heard.

According to Mr. J. H. Thomas, at the recent Regional Conference at Derby, the Labour Party would go further than the Washington Conference in the matter of limiting armaments. "When the Labour Party demanded disarmament it meant it to apply on land, and in the air, as well as on sea."

Dear! dear! And who will they "demand" it of? Everybody knows that the capitalists themselves are the people who will determine what methods of force shall or shall not, prevail. If we find them "limiting" themselves in any particular direction, it is not in response to any "demand," it is because it suits them to do so—in this case because they find the process a rather expensive one.

Questions of disarmament are not working class questions. It may be true, as our "leaders" point out, that millions are being spent on improving the fighting machinery, but it concerns us not in the least.

The worker is robbed, once and for all, at the point of production—that is, in the workshop. When he gets his packet at the week-end, he has got all that is coming to him—he has been skinned to the limit. What happens to the wealth he has been robbed of after he has drawn his pay can make not one iota of difference to his position. The main point is—he hasn't got it. Whether his boss buys cigars or battleships with the money, whether he buys a new car for his wife, or a string of pearls for his mistress, it is all the same—to us.

Armaments, wars, unemployment and poverty are only features of capitalism. They should not be isolated, and efforts concentrated on their abolition, because that is impossible while the system lasts.

The Socialist does not pick out one or two disagreeable things which exist, and concentrate all his energies in "demanding" of those who are responsible for their existence that they shall forthwith abolish them, for that would be foolish. While the Labour Party is organising to "demand" changes within the capitalist system, the Socialist Party is organising to overthrow the system. There's the difference.

TOM SALA.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE

S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C. 1.

A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF THE SOCIALIST THEORY.

VALUE (continued.)

A commodity has two forms—a physical form (coat, basket, spade, and so forth), and a value form (its worth—though not necessarily its price). As we have already seen, it is a useful article and a valuable article. Its valuable property is made evident in exchange relations. Exchange is very complex now (as witness the recent clear understanding of it can be obtained by voluminous literature on currency), but a examining, in the first place, the simplest form of exchange—or value relation, and then progressing through the more complex forms to the modern price form.

The simplest value relation is the relation of one commodity to another one of a different kind. Let us take Marx's illustration. Suppose we assume that

20 yards of linen equals 1 coat;
now let us analyse this simple relation.

The first thing we learn from it (arising out of what we have previously learnt) is that the same amount of energy was used up in producing the 20 yards of linen as was used up in producing the coat. In other words, the same quantity of the same underlying substance is contained in each of these physically different objects. Value is hidden underneath the value relation. In order to elucidate this point it is necessary to forget, for the moment, the quantity side of the matter (20 yards equals 1) and examine the quality side (linen equals coat). It is obvious that "the magnitude of different things can only be compared quantitatively when those magnitudes are expressed in terms of the same unit." The basis of the relation we are examining is the essential equality of the linen and the coat as products of human energy.

In the linen equals coat value relation the two articles take entirely different, in fact opposite, parts. In putting them into such a relation to one another an essential peculiarity becomes clear; and that peculiarity is that only the value of the linen is being stated—and it is being stated under the disguise of the physical form of the coat. The coat is giving a visible form to the invisible value hidden in the linen. The human energy that was used up in the manufacture of the

linen is now represented by the coat itself. The coat as a coat is of no interest to us, we are only concerned with it as solid value, the representative of the value contained in the linen.

If the foregoing is clear, then it must be obvious that if we wished to state the value of the coat it would be necessary to reverse the positions of the two articles in the relation, e.g.,

1 coat equals 20 yards of linen.

We have already pointed out earlier in our investigation that human energy can only be measured when it is used up—when it is represented by some object that has been produced. In other words, tailoring or weaving cannot be collected in jugs, although the tailor and weaver have given away something the loss of which makes them feel tired, and necessitates the taking in of more replacing material in the form of food. Further, human energy can only be measured relatively—the product of one man's work with the product of another man's work; or the product of the same man's work in different kinds of articles; finally, the proportions of the total energy of society employed in producing different objects. In the example quoted we have the point illustrated—the quantity of human energy employed in the production of linen is compared with that employed in the production of coats. Appearance tends to hide this fact more and more with the growing complexity of exchange.

From the simplest form of value relation it will be seen that in expressing the value of one article in another each takes up opposite positions in the form of expression. The coat, in the expression 20 yards of linen equals 1 coat, occupies the position of equivalent, i.e., the equal to the value of the linen; the linen, on the other hand, occupies the position of relative, i.e., the article whose value is being expressed in its relation to that of the coat. The linen is only *linen* in this example, but the coat is value itself; 20 yards of linen, for instance, is 1 coat's worth of linen in the case in question.

As these two articles take up opposite positions in the above relation, an effect in one direction on one of them affects the other in the opposite direction. If some new method were devised whereby 40 yards of linen could be produced with the same ex-

penditure of energy as it formerly took to produce 20 yards, then the value relation would be (other things remaining the same):

40 yards of linen equals 1 coat,

or 20 yards of linen equals $\frac{1}{2}$ coat.

A fall in the relative value of linen and a rise in the relative value of coats. If, on the other hand, there were a reduction by half in the energy cost of production of coats the relation would be:

20 yards of linen equals 2 coats,

or 10 yards of linen equals 1 coat.

A fall in the relative of coats and a rise in the relative value of linen.

It is apparent, then, that one article cannot occupy both positions in the same value expression; it cannot be at the same time relative and equivalent—i.e., the article whose value is being stated, and also the object in which that value is being stated. In other words, in a particular value expression an article that occupies one side is thereby excluded from occupying the other side. As Marx puts it:—

"The relative form and the equivalent form are two intimately connected, mutually dependent and inseparable elements of the expression of value; but, at the same time, are mutually exclusive, antagonistic extremes—i.e., poles of the same expression."

By putting the linen and the coat into the above value relation we are, in reality, illustrating the fact that value-making labour is simple abstract labour. Although the linen and the coat are produced by different kinds of work (weaving and tailoring), and perhaps work of different degrees of skill, yet they are, at bottom, the product of just definite quantities of general labour, and hence they can be put into a relation based upon their equality. Weaving, so far as it produces value, is the same as tailoring.

Perhaps an illustration may make this point clearer.

The making of a coat is one particular form in which a tailor uses his energy; the making of a pair of trousers is another and different particular form, yet coat-making and trouser-making are only different forms of the general activity known as tailoring. Similarly, all productive activity, no matter what particular form it may take, is simply different forms under which human energy is used up.

From the above analysis of the simplest form in which the value of a commodity is made evident, it will be seen that value does not originate in the value form (20 yards of

linen equals one coat), but, on the contrary, this form of expression can only exist because commodities contain value—the form arises out of the nature of value. In other words, value does not originate in exchange, as the advocates of capitalism would have us believe, but value must exist before the exchange relation can arise; production precedes exchange; articles must be produced before they can be exchanged. An article exchanges—or is a commodity—because it possesses value; it does not possess value because it exchanges. It is by taking the form of exchange value—entering into a value relation—that the value of a commodity is given an independent and definite form—in our example the form is that of the coat.

As we have already shown, there is no opposition contained in each commodity between use-value and value. This opposition is given an objective or obvious existence when we put two commodities into an exchange relation, one appearing simply as a use-value (the linen) and the other as value itself (the coat). Consequently, the simple form of value—the one we are examining—is that in which this opposition or contrast is clearly demonstrated.

The form of value we have analysed Marx describes as the "elementary or accidental form of value." It is defined as "accidental" because the position of a commodity on one or the other side of the relation (as relative or equivalent) depends entirely upon accident, whether it is the one whose value is being expressed or the one expressing value.

Throughout all history the articles obtained by the expenditure of human energy have been use-values—i.e., useful articles—but it was only at a definite point in social development that such articles became commodities—i.e., useful articles produced for exchange. That point was the period when the human energy used up in their production expressed as objective qualities of these articles—as their value. Consequently, the simple form of value is also the earliest historical form under which a product of human energy appeared as a commodity. The earliest form of exchange was primitive barter on the boundaries of ancient territories or during the accidental meetings of peoples on the march. We will make a more detailed examination of the historical development of exchange later on.—GILMAC

(To be continued.)

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 8s. 0d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY



JAN. 7, 1922

H. M. HYNDMAN:

The death of Mr. H. M. Hyndman, at a ripe old age, removes a figure of some prominence from the public life of this country.

He was an example of how an individual, without any outstanding abilities, could become noticeable by association with a set of ideas—not his own—that have stirred the modern world.

When the discoveries and ideas of Marx and Engels were first being spread in this country, H. M. Hyndman took up those ideas and, despite the fact of their unpopularity, became an advocate of them. The fact that he was a rich man added spice to the position he had taken up.

His grasp of the economic teachings of Marx was good and probably one of the most effective displays he gave in this connection was his lecture on "The Final Futility of Final Utility," given before the Economic Circle of the National Liberal Club.

It is interesting to note that the great defenders of Jevon's theory of "Final Utility"—like G. B. Shaw, Professors Foxwell, Wicksteed, Sidney Webb, etc.—though specially invited, failed to attend that lecture to defend their favourite theory. Maybe the reason is not difficult to find.

The other great discoveries of Marx and Engels, particularly their philosophy of

history, he never assimilated, nor even appeared to understand. This lack of understanding led him into various anti-Socialist activities. In opposition to Marx and Engels he held to the Blanquist position that the establishment of Socialism would be brought about by an "intelligent minority" leading the working class to their emancipation.

It easily followed from this that he was ready to indulge in political compromise—to the great confusion of his followers—and carried this to its logical conclusion when, at the outbreak of the Great War, he became a rabid "patriot," although, with curious inconsistency, he declared that the position of the workers would remain the same no matter which side won.

As one of the so-called "well-educated class" who stood for Marxian economics when others claiming to be Socialists, like Webb, Shaw, etc., were opposing those theories, he will be remembered as something of a pioneer of those days. It was inevitable that his misunderstandings of the Marxian philosophy should have resulted in mis-education and mental confusion among the ranks of the advanced sections of the working class with whom he came in contact either by pen or platform. Some would argue that this confusion and misleading did harm to such an extent as to far outweigh the value of his work in other directions. This is probably true, but it does not obscure the fact that he stood for Marxism when it was being reviled in its early days, and he will be remembered much more for the position he then occupied than for the errors and anti-Socialist actions of his later years.

J. F.

£1,000 FUND.

List of contributions to the above fund will appear in the February issue. Owing to matter not having been made up in time, we regret having to omit same from this number.

In the meantime we should like to remind our wealthy subscribers that we do not refuse New Year Gifts, however large they may be.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra.
To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

CAPITALISM IN EAST AFRICA.

Some seven years ago the present scribe ventured, in the shape of an article in these columns (History in the Making), certain observations on economic conditions in East Africa. The interest in these conditions recently displayed by the British capitalist press (from the *Observer* to the *Winning Post*) tempts him to amplify these observations and bring them up to date; especially as the Great War and its effects have forced into prominence the increasing importance of the tropical and sub-tropical zones as sources of raw material and markets for the products of European industry.

The popular notion of tropical Africa derived from the mal-education provided for the workers by the masters might be summed up in three words: "swamps, jungles, and deserts"! While these are by no means figments of the imagination, they do not exhaust the picture. There are thousands of square miles of grassy plains supporting thousands of head of cattle and sheep. There are hundreds of thousands of acres of rich arable land already bringing forth to some extent cotton, sisal, flax, maize, coffee and a host of other items of foodstuffs and raw materials. There are mountain ranges, ten thousand feet or more in height, and hundreds of miles in length, covered with valuable timber, and there are immense lakes and rivers capable, when thoroughly harnessed by the aid of modern science, of irrigating the wildernesses and electrifying half the continent. In fact, there need be no wonder as to why the capitalist powers parcelled out Africa amongst them; its economic possibilities are prodigious! The fly in the ointment is the intrinsic character of capitalism as a system.

In the first place, being a system of exploitation, based upon the monopoly by a small class of the means of life, it meets with the resistance of a relatively intractable human element. It is one thing to proclaim political control of an area several times larger than Britain, and lease to individual capitalists and syndicates large tracts thereof, and quite another to get the small native population to work for that class so established. Extremists among the white invaders (drawn from the bankrupt middle-class of Europe) have from time to time suggested the radical expropriation of the

natives from the soil, but when it is remembered that the natives have few wants, that these are easily satisfied by means of a few acres, and that in any case the total population of Kenya Colony, for example, does not amount to three millions, the technical difficulties in the way of this policy are obvious.

To be sure, bows and arrows, spears and swords would be of little avail against rifles and machine-guns, to say nothing of bombs from aeroplanes, but a solution of the labour problem which consisted simply in exterminating the available supply of labour power would hardly advance capitalist production. This lesson has, of course, had to be learnt from practical Imperial experience in more southerly portions of the continent, such as Rhodesia. A policy which has been applied with success in Europe and Asia, with their redundant millions, has had to be modified when dealing with under-populated Africa.

Secondly, the immensity of Africa's resources is matched by the immensity of its problems. Stock and plant diseases require scientific investigation and control; huge distances require corresponding transport facilities and a comprehensive system of education, technical and literary, has to be established before the native tribes can be expected to keep pace with demands of European progress. All this involves an application of social energy and resources on a magnificent scale, for which capitalism, so far, has provided no adequate organisation.

Every form of capitalist enterprise, from that of the small individual concern to that of the State itself, has but one motive, i.e., the acquisition of profit. It shuns outlay which does not yield a rapid return. It has no interest in posterity. The capitalist class is in Africa to scratch the surface, not to dig deeply; it exhausts temporarily rather than develop natural wealth. Its public representatives talk large and ambitiously. They recognise that this is no country for the "small man," though they have not hesitated to lure him here in considerable numbers for the purpose of sucking him dry. (They call this "encouraging population.") But their activities get little further than talk.

The total white population of East Africa (up till recently predominantly bourgeois) would not provide a decent gate at a second-rate football match in England. Many a scarcely-heard-of country market-town

boasts of greater numbers. Yet this brave land does not hesitate to arrogate to itself the title of "community" (the thirty thousand odd Indians and natives to the tune of two and a half million being, of course, mere outsiders). While never ceasing to regard the Government as the source of all its woes, it everlastingly appeals to this same Government for this, that or the other scheme without which the "country" must go bankrupt. The Government, in turn, pleads lack of funds; is, in fact, itself on the verge of bankruptcy. It is helpless without loans from the seat of Empire, and the Imperial financiers are not philanthropists. They, too, want quick returns.

All this means that the Government must find revenue. Its attempt to do this by means of an income tax produced, of course, the usual excruciating groans from the "community," which promptly went economy mad. The wholesale discharge of white employees by business firms was followed by a ruthless attack on Civil servants' salaries by the elected members of the Legislative Council. These members, most of them large land owners, recently styled themselves the Reform Party, and distinguished themselves by initiating a crusade against the Indian bourgeoisie, who are pressing even more insistently for equal political and legal rights. The pursuits of this latter group are mainly mercantile, though town property is also one of their specialities.

Enormously enriched by the war boom, they in turn have financed an active Radical propaganda, not merely among their own races but also among the natives, proving in this latter respect more astute than their white opponents. These, in turn, are now forced to adopt a most comical defence, i.e., that they (who have only recently reduced native wages by one-third all-round and who, in season and out of season, have publicly abused the native as a loafer, an ingrate and an immoral and bestial ruffian) are, in reality, the protectors of native interests against Asiatic aggression, the preservers of native innocence from Oriental corruption! Before the war this invocation of the native as a political factor in his own land would have appeared ridiculous, but he, too, is changing his outlook.

Although the Government has been inclined to be chary of conscripting labour for the benefit of every Tom, Dick and Harry of the capitalist class, it has not hesitated

to do so for its own needs. It compulsorily recruited the male natives by the thousand for the military labour corps serving in German East Africa (now Tanganyika Territory), and by the thousand these unfortunates died of starvation, disease and overwork. Vague promises of future reward smoothed the process whereby they were torn away from their homes, and, as usual, these promises proved even more fragile than piecrust. On the contrary, the shortage of labour gave the reason and excuse for a systematic attack upon the native position. In the first place the survivors, on their return, found that the system of registration to which they had become accustomed under the military authorities, was being extended permanently to civil life. Every adult male native employee was docketed and numbered, and provided with a certificate bearing his thumb-print and evidence of his economic history. This badge of slavery serves the same purpose as the brands on the bodies of English proletarians in the 16th and 17th Centuries. It is in every respect an excellent instrument of persecution.

The next "reward" for the heroes was an increase in taxation (levied at so much per head and per hut) of about fifty per cent. ! This on the top of a serious famine which quadrupled maize prices! These famines, which occur in cycles of roughly ten years, are due to rain failure, but are enormously and tragically aggravated by the financial pressure upon the population. In order to find the money for the taxes the native husbandmen (used to cultivating according to their needs) sell the surplus, which in good seasons, should be stored against the inevitable bad ones. They thus sell at the *cheapest* time and find it necessary to buy just when grain is *dear*!

This is fairly obviously the road to ruin! Slowly, but surely, the young men drift to the plantations or the tin-shack townships in search of wages and just as surely increasing numbers of their would-be wives seek refuge in the brothels.

The white "settlers" did not take long to seize their opportunity. The same precious Reform Party above mentioned organised a universal wage-cut. The drop in the extravagant prices of their exported produce supplying the scarcely-needed stimulus.

They were encouraged by the introduction

of the much-discussed Labour Ordinance, according to which the native chiefs were converted in practice into labour recruiters primarily for the Government, secondarily for the settlers. And it is curious to note that this measure was introduced by the very man (Colonel Ainsworth, Chief Native Commissioner) who earned the execration of these same settlers by his amendments to the Masters and Servants' Ordinance.

These amendments, based on war experience, were "intended" to protect native employees from excessive exploitation by the provision of adequate housing, feeding, medical attention, etc. Like the early factory acts in Britain, however, these measures of elementary prudence remain a dead letter through lack of the official machinery necessary to give them real effect.

Having shot his bolt, Colonel Ainsworth retired from the scene of action. So often styled a "pro-native," his real attitude may be summed up as follows: Speaking before the Legislative Council on March 12th, 1918, he said: "Whatever our policy . . . there must and can be only one fundamental as regards rule . . . the white man must be paramount—a white minority will, in reality, form the government, and consequently over ninety per cent. of the total population comprising the black races will practically remain without any real voice in their own affairs."

E. B.

(To be continued.)

"THE FRENCH REVOLUTION."

The French Revolution has been a favourite topic with historians of all countries, and it has probably called forth more books than any other event in the history of the world. Yet in the whole literature of the subject one can find little that is consistently good; there is a disproportionate amount of chaff. A book that has just come into my hands, "A Brief History of the French Revolution," by F. W. Aveling, is, however, so really bad, that I think it deserves notice, if only to warn those who might, in their hurry, confuse the author with Edward Aveling, and buy it.

In his preface the author states that the book is intended primarily as a school textbook. No doubt it will have success as such, for it is moulded on the true lines of all modern school histories. It is a

string of events, with nothing to connect them, each one seemingly an accident. The true causes of the revolution and its meaning, the knowledge of which might cause pupils to grow interested in a dangerous field of inquiry, are hidden, and instead the reader is offered a few trumpery excuses, which explain nothing and lead nowhere, but which satisfy that craving for sensation which springs from faulty education and the degrading influence of the press. Aveling's causes of the Revolution bear the same relation to the real origin as does the popular idea of profiteering to the profit-making system. They serve only to hide the relevant facts.

Three reasons are given, viz.:

(1) The vices and extravagances of the kings and their court.

(2) The writings of the philosophers and literary men, particularly of J. J. Rousseau; and the growth of unbelief in religion.

(3) Bad government on the part of the rulers of the land: the oppression of the poor by aristocrats: the absence of any political power on the part of the great mass of the people.

No mention is made of its being a Revolution of the bourgeoisie; rather it is made to appear as working class in its objects, and this, although it is now agreed that the French Revolution was the homologue of the English Revolution of 1640-60, 1688, that it was the triumph of the Capitalist class and the final overthrow of feudalism. Such an omission might be excused to a contemporary, but in a modern history it becomes a suppression, and one is compelled to think that the author is deliberately misleading.

The immorality of the Bourbons had as little to do with the French Revolution as did the morality of Charles I. with the English.

And in view of the fact that the poor in France had always been oppressed by the aristocrats and had never had any political power, it is useless to suggest that this oppression and lack of political power alone could have precipitated the Revolution of 1789. Why 1789 rather than 1400?

The prominence of the philosophers and their sceptical teaching themselves require an explanation. Our author does not, or will not, see this, and so it is not given.

Let us see why the revolution came in

the eighteenth rather than in the fifteenth century.

In the first place, it is necessary to remember that this, like all others, was an economic revolution. It arose owing to the necessity to industrialism of the abolition of the remnants of the feudal barriers. It was a revolution of the French bourgeoisie, which was confronted with impotence and ruin unless it could seize political power and enter on the same course of expansion as England and the newly-freed American Republic.

Up to then political power was concentrated in the hands of a bureaucratic despotism. The nobles and clergy retained their social positions, feudal privileges, and rights. This hampered the development of the industrial and trading classes, for which a free working-class, as opposed to feudal serfs, and a free circulation of commodities were essential. The *Gabelle*, a government monopoly of the sale of salt, and the *Banvin*, or the right enjoyed by the lord of the manor to sell his own wine in the parish, to the exclusion of any other, are but two examples of the many feudal privileges which stood in the way of free development of commerce and industry.

Again, taxation was high, and owing to the exemption from it enjoyed by the nobles and clerics, its burden fell on the propertied commercial class. In the army aristocrats held the chief posts, so that the ambitions of bourgeois officers were checked. This explains the willingness of the lower officers to usurp authority and lead their troops against the dominant class.

It was the growth of the bourgeoisie in France, with its accompanying necessity for a new philosophy and set of ideals, which gave rise to the liberal spirit noticeable earlier in the century. In particular, intercourse with other countries and with England, from which the newly invented machinery was beginning to be imported, fostered this spirit, of which the writings of Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau are but the expression. To place too great an importance in the effects of their books is dangerous, especially as only about 4 per cent. of the population could read.

They were the philosophers of the rising capitalists, and it was among the members of this class in the main that they found readers and popularity.

To say, as the author does, that they spread democratic ideas among the masses,

is to show a complete ignorance of their works.

Rousseau looked longingly to the Roman State and a return to nature. Montesquieu and Voltaire aimed merely at adopting the English constitutional system. Buckle, in his "Civilisation in England," lays great stress on this, and Gustave le Bon, a middle-class author, writes: "Although the philosophers, who have been supposed the inspirers of the French Revolution, did attack certain privileges and abuses, we must not for that reason regard them as partisans of popular government" ("Psychology of Revolution").

When Louis XVI., owing to the financial difficulties of the government, was forced to summon the States General, the time for the seizure of political power by the revolutionary bourgeoisie had arrived.

To obtain control of the Tiers Etat, they, with their cry of "Free the land!" obtained the support of the peasants, but "they were as undemocratic at bottom as men well could be; their feeling for the masses was nothing but a mixture of scorn and fear; the perfect type of the bourgeois of '89 combined hatred of the nobles with distrust of the mob" ("French Revolution," Louis Madelin).

Thanks to the support of the lesser clergy, who suffered from the tyranny of the great prelates, they obtained control in the National Assembly, and at once proceeded to destroy all that remained of feudalism. In a short time seigneurial rights were abolished, serfs were freed, and later the Church lands were confiscated.

Meanwhile, in the towns unemployment, consequent on machine production superseding hand labour in many trades, together with lack of bread, occasioned by bad harvests, destruction of the crops by agents of the bourgeoisie, and the speculations of the grain merchants, who were holding back supplies, caused the workers to support the rising class. This provided them with a force which at need they could bring out to overcome the Royalists.

The weakness of Louis and the need to crush the nobility and clergy completely, rendered the introduction of a constitutional monarchy impossible, although certain sections favoured it. And so Louis was executed and a Republic proclaimed.

The rising of the Revolution from the National Assembly to the Directory, which

paved the way for Napoleon to consolidate the gains of the triumphant class, is a history of struggles between sections of the bourgeoisie, and of their efforts to drive back the workers into subjection after they had served the needs of their masters.

Even the Terror is a period of bourgeois domination.

But our author would not stain the honour of the master class, our present rulers, so he reviles the workers for the executions. And this in spite of the fact that "out of 2,750 victims of Robespierre only 650 belonged to the upper or middle classes. The tumbrils that wended their way daily to the Place de la Revolution and afterwards to the Faubourg St. Antoine were largely filled with working-men" ("French Revolution," Belfort Bax).

Robespierre himself was merely a tool, although perhaps an unconscious tool, of the bourgeoisie; he served them by destroying the more liberal-minded Herbertists, and was destroyed himself when his task was accomplished.

But although it was not, and could not be, a working-class revolution, study of the French Revolution is of value to the proletariat for two reasons. Firstly, it demonstrates the truth of the Materialist Conception of History.

Society rests on an economic basis and it is only by examination of this foundation that one can understand the nature and development of the institutions, ideas, and cultural activities of the classes of which the particular society is composed, and explain outstanding historical and political movements and events.

Secondly, it shows the futility of working-class action without class-consciousness.

The workers allowed themselves to be stirred up to do the behests of a higher class, they fought their battles for them, and then, when they had done all that was wanted of them, they were forced into a new and worse servitude. They were surrounded and disarmed on their return from the army. Their organisations were broken up by "Jeunesse Dorée" (the White Guards of the period) armed with weighted canes!

And attempts of the workers to achieve their emancipation will always end in failure until they, by study, learn their position in society as slaves of the propertied

class, and then, acting as a class, gain control of political power and the force it commands. W. J. R.

A CHRISTMAS CAROL.

Once again we have been treated to the customary sentimental piffle in the press regarding what is known as the festive season. The *Daily News* has made for us the round of the pulpits, so that our hearts may be made strong and our spirits raised to face the coming year. But, alas! there is always a fly in the ointment; and though the *D.N.* has done its best it could not avoid mentioning unemployment. But stoutly ignoring the other 364 days, it gleefully informs us that "for the first time there was no need for anyone to be hungry on Christmas Day." If we ask, Is there any need for anyone to be hungry on, say, the 2nd of April, we shall be told we are extremists and disturbers of the social peace!

Nevertheless, we do ask it; and since the *D.N.* will not answer us we will address our query to you. When you drew your savings from the slate club on Christmas Eve, did you bother to think that you have no guarantee that you will not be hungry on the 2nd of April? For our part, we should think that the hard-earned turkey on Christmas Day and no other day would be one of the most cogent reasons for discontent. We do not insist that life is most happily spent in eating turkey and Christmas pudding each day of the year, but with no desire to hurt the feelings and heartfulness (poet's license, and be careful of the "H," Mr. Printer) of the *D.N.*, we cannot see that there is any cause for congratulation in the fact that everybody had one meal for keeps in 1921. Mind you, we are not making too scathing a criticism, we are resolutely dismissing from our memory the poor wretch we met this morning who had subsisted on Christmas Day on little more than a crust of bread. We will not let creep into our minds the image of the thousands whom we know have not the wherewithal to eat nor to sleep at Christmas time, nor, indeed, at any other time.

If, however, we must justify our existence by acting the "skeleton at the feast," we will respectfully inform the *D.N.* that not only is their statement a lie, but that it is an insult. And that, we think, all things considered, is just about as politely as we dare put it. S.

FOSTER PARENTS.

It is interesting to note how at this time of the year the Press weep tears of tenderness over the starving bodies of the workers who have been cast down to such depths of misery by the workings of the capitalist system; the hypocrisy of the writers is only emphasised by the humility with which the doles of food and clothing are received by the victims of capitalism. Under the heading of "Adopting a Family: a Useful Birmingham Scheme," the *Birmingham Mail* (20-11-'21) quotes the *Daily Post*: "The suggestion that individuals should 'adopt' necessitous families has elicited a promising response and a considerable extension of the movement appears likely."

Apparently, the master class are somewhat alarmed at the widespread effects of the industrial crisis and the possibility of disturbances if no attempt is made to alleviate the distress other than by the Government unemployment pay, or the Guardians' dole; hence the special efforts and the appeals to Christmas sentiment to gain support for the various schemes of adoption, Christmas dinners, etc., in order to counteract any attempt by the unemployed to parade their miseries before the very doors of their masters.

It is probable also that there is a fear that the efficiency of the working class will be seriously deteriorated, and therefore the necessity arises for them to be kept in such physical health as will ensure wage slaves capable of standing the strain of the next period of booming trade.

The *Post* admits the "State benefit is barely sufficient to pay the rent; the Guardians," we are told, "are willing to adopt a scale of relief which ensures the recipient from starvation."

May I suggest that there are three grades of starvation: firstly, nothing at all to eat unless one takes on the rôle of a Nebuchadnezzar, or the advice of Foulon, "Let them eat grass." Secondly, the Guardians' scale—just sufficient to keep a flicker of life in the badly-clothed cold-racked bodies of the unemployed. Thirdly, the miserable wage (a much desired attainment) of the employed, which will buy a few more ounces of marge and a few more pounds of bacon and cheese than fall to the lot of the unemployed; in short, the necessary fuel to generate the energy to set in motion the human machine

for its purpose under capitalism—the production of surplus value. "Truth will out" is an old saying, and its aptness is clear in the following:—"The present trade depression is unparalleled in extent, and has engulfed hundreds, if not thousands, of families who have never before been unable to provide for themselves. This is their first acquaintance with poverty and adversity, and many of them will suffer untold misery rather than appeal to the poor law."

To the worker who gives any thought to his position the true interpretation of that statement goes far beyond the desire of the composer; these thousands of families were previously in the third stage, before mentioned, of starvation, as the fact that they are now in the first stage proves, for they were not able whilst at work to provide for the rainy day which capitalist mentors are always so keen on exhorting them to prepare for. The drizzle is always with the working class, excepting when, as now, it rains with a vengeance.

The article informs us that families are recommended by a body called the "Citizen Society," with which enquirers are put in touch. And then follows an instance how the scheme works.

An inquirer desired to be put into communication with some suitable family; he was supplied with the particulars of two (suitable, of course), and the inquirer wrote the *Post* as follows: "I visited the two families whose names you gave me, and both seem such genuine ones that I have decided to adopt the two."

What sublime feelings of humanity came over the visitor whilst inspecting these cases that "seem" to be so suitable, so genuine! One can almost imagine them to be cases of whiskey, with appropriate labels of "Genuine Scotch," about which the inquisitor appears a little doubtful, and prefers caution until actual experience with the liquor enables him to give a more pronounced opinion.

At this rate of adoption there will not be a single starving family in Birmingham; perhaps not in the whole country—until next summer. Further, there can be no doubt a desperate struggle will take place between individual capitalists for the genuine best brands to be plucked from the hell of starvation; in my mind's-eye I can see a smug, philanthropic, hygienic Lord of Ballyville Paradise having it on with the Screwjahn

of Brum. as to which shall have the honour of relieving some necessitous family. Life will be one long holiday for the unemployed, with cakes and pictures thrown in, if this idea spreads. But stay, who is going to decide the scale (useful term) of food for the adopted family; what will be the menu? Will it assume the proportions of a ration just sufficient to keep alive the victims of capitalism, or will it be on the same scale as the patron's family?

We get a little enlightenment on this point when we read in relation to the adopted family of the staff of the *Post*: "it is hoped to keep the family in a state of efficiency until they are again able to provide for themselves."

So it is evident the adopted are to have just enough for the purpose of keeping them in such condition as when the depression is over they will be capable of producing once again a maximum of surplus value for their masters, and thus the true reason for the scheme leaks out. But the generosity embodied in it is of so far-reaching a character that it is necessary for others to share in it, and so the co-operation of individuals, of church, of shop, and office staffs is called for, in order "to see some deserving case through the trials of winter."

Those in work are reminded they can adopt a family or families "according to the means at their disposal." This implies that the rich are so desirous of helping the starving unemployed that they ask the starving employed to help with contributions from wages which have been bumping down during the last year.

"Personal adoption has great potentialities for good," we are told. "It introduces the personal touch which is so valuable to both parties to the transaction, and creates an atmosphere of friendliness and sympathy which is lacking in the most carefully conceived forms of public charity."

Such schemes can only be valuable to one party, and that party is the ruling class, for the notion is kept alive that humanity is all that is required to regulate the affairs and alleviate the troubles of the present; they are built up on the assumption that there must always be poverty, and the idea is general amongst the workers that it is the duty of the rich to alleviate the miseries of the poor with gifts of clothing, food and money. It is not the duty of the rich, neither is it the duty of groups of workers

such as office and works staffs to take part in such temporary expedients. The former will pretend there is such a thing as duty in this connection, and preach that duty to others through their mouthpieces in the Press and pulpit, in order to lighten the burden for themselves. But when the working class, unemployed or employed, delve down to the root reason for their misery and poverty, they will then see that trade depressions with their effects, and trade booms with their overwork, inevitably accompany a system of world-wide commodity production.

The abolition of poverty can only be within measure of realisation when the workers understand that the material conditions for producing wealth as water flows from a tap are here; they will then march on direct to the goal, the possession of the political machine, and in the name of society convert the land, factories and tools from private into common property.

The basis of society having then undergone the revolutionary change, that freedom which poets sing of will be possible; no man, woman or child will be patronised, for each man and woman capable of work will take his or her part in the social labours required by society's needs, and the fruits of those labours being owned by the whole of society must needs be distributed in conformity with that basis. When the working class understand the principles of Socialism they will take the necessary action to abolish capitalism with its attendant evils of poverty and canting humbug, removing once and for all the obstacle which stands in the way of equality, liberty and fraternity.

E. J.

Will those interested

in the formation of a branch of the Party in Peckham, Camberwell and district,

Please communicate with:—

J. VEASEY,

c/o The Socialist Party of Great Britain,
17, MOUNT PLEASANT, W.C.1.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spiceal-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.8. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Sec., 142 Bulwer-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER.—Communications to Sec., J. Lloyd 2 Chapel-st., Chester-rd., Hulme, Manchester.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Monday at 7, at 107, Charlotte Street, W.1. Communications to Sec., 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. Discussion after branch business.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 24 Worslade-rd., Tooting, S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., C. Stowe, 15 Culvert-rd., S. Tottenham, N.15. Branch meets Saturdays 7.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS
LONDON DISTRICT.**Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Edmonton, Silver Street, 11.30 a.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Stratford, Vicarage-lane, 7.30 p.m.
Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 a.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m.
Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.
Wimbledon Broadway, 8 p.m.

Fridays:

Tottenham, Junction Clyde-road and Phillip-lane, 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.
Tooting, Undine-street, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.; and
Printed by R. E. TAYLOR & SON, LTD., 55/57, Banner Street, London, E.C.1.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 210. VOL. 18.]

LONDON, FEBRUARY, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

THE COLLAPSE OF CAPITALISM.

There is a notion widely held in certain circles that capitalism is in a state of collapse, or at least, that its collapse is imminent; and this is interpreted to mean that the existing system of society will reach a point at which the production and distribution of commodities will cease, and the whole of the mechanism of Society will fail any longer to operate. Those who propagate this conception naturally accept the view that the tactics of the working class organisation must be framed with this-collapse always in mind.

The illustration given recently by one of them—Mr. Palme Dutt—was the comparison of the present social order to a house admitted to be in a far from perfect condition. Of the occupants there was a section which considered redecoration and repair to be sufficient, while another section thought that nothing less than demolition and building anew would meet the needs of the situation. These sections represent the reformists and revolutionaries respectively. Now, however, the war and the Russian revolution have brought new factors to bear, and the dispute has been removed to another plane, the only question now being not *whether* to destroy, but *how* to rebuild. The house is said, in fact, to have collapsed about the ears of the dwellers through its own rottenness.

This sounds plausible indeed, but argument by analogy is dangerous. Has capitalism collapsed? and to what extent have the war and the Russian revolution altered, apart from having merely intensified, the previous structural defects?

The Third International lays it down that "The present is the period of the breakdown of Capitalism," but does the evidence support this or do the "Third's" adherents act as if it were true? The answer is decidedly no.

In America Max Eastman (Communist) says "This statement is not true of the United States in the same immediate sense that it may be true of Europe. We are not in the period of the breakdown of Capitalism" (Liberator, October.) He continues: "We (the American Communists) are employing tactics that could never be appropriate in any other period." Now, the American Communist Party has "gone west," and it is generally agreed that part, if not all, of the cause of their failure, was their attempt to apply a policy based on a condition of affairs which did not exist. Does that support the view that Capitalism is in collapse?

In Canada, which was wildly alleged to be on the verge of revolution at the time of the post-war Winnipeg strikes, a general election has just taken place which has led to the defeat of the conservative party by avowedly capitalist Liberals; the election having been fought on a tariff issue. There has not, apparently, been one Socialist returned.

In Australia, despite its heavy roll of unemployed, and its wage reductions, the "Proletarian" (Melbourne, 7th November) writes: "But until the full force of the present world depression reaches our shores the Australian working class will not be very susceptible to Communist propaganda."

In Europe, where the full effect of the

trade depression has been felt, does the economic system show any noticeable lack of vitality, or do the capitalists act in any but their accustomed aggressive manner towards the workers? In spite of the enormous amount of unemployment, curtailment of production, and relative overstocking of markets, are there any strikingly new factors to be considered after one has allowed for the expected after-war depression, the destruction of the war and the blockade, the new political frontiers and the chaos of the exchanges, all of them more or less normal phases of capitalism or the usual experiences after previous wars?

The struggle for markets may have been intensified, but does this call for new revolutionary tactics?

What of the Russian revolution? Here, again, the importance has been overestimated. The re-placing of Czarist feudal Russia by a capitalistic republic, even if the latter remains permanently under the Bolshevik Government, is the net result of the revolution, and it has only loomed so large because of the more or less accidental circumstances that it was the Bolsheviks who were brought into prominence by it.

If capitalism were in collapse would the Bolsheviks be relying on capitalist enterprise to rebuild Russia, a process which they admit will take decades at least? Would our own Communist Party feel the need to ally itself with the Labour Party to get the latter into power? The fact is the capacity of the capitalist system to recover from its depression has been under-rated and the Communists have in practice been forced to discard their theory. From the day when Marx and Engels wrote "There is a spectre haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism," there have continually been people who have under-estimated, as well as others like Hyndman, who never understood, but were always seeing revolution imminent in every momentary pause or set-back in capitalistic development.

In the minds, too, of some of its adherents, this theory of collapse is nothing but a failure to appreciate the Marxian viewpoint. The idea of an actual physical stoppage of production is not Marxian. Societies do not collapse like jerry-built houses. Marx wrote:—"The knell of capitalist private property sounds when the monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has

sprung up and flourished along with it, and under it," but as Boudin particularly points out (Theoretical System of Karl Marx) "He does not say that production under the old system must become impossible before a revolution sets in," and again, "as far as the purely mechanical breakdown of capitalism is concerned . . . it is not a physical breakdown, as would be necessary in order to exclude the necessary intervention of conscious human activity, but rather a moral bankruptcy. Certainly there is absolutely nothing in the capitalist system to prevent it from relapsing into a sort of new feudalism or slavery . . ." (p. 253). What Marx did mean, therefore, by the idea of the breakdown of Capitalism was the working-out of its inherent contradictions plus recognition by the workers that the continued existence of a system of society based on their exploitation is unnecessary and intolerable and that the class of exploiters no longer performs useful social functions. The moment of that recognition is the moment of the overthrow of class domination.

But it may be said "Capitalism can no longer employ its wage slaves, nor feed the unemployed." But did it ever? Is unemployment new? and did Capitalism even in its days of most virile expansion and development provide an adequate standard of living for workers, employed or unemployed? Did the capitalists trouble about security for their victims? Everyone knows they did not: and yet the system survived.

It is of no use waiting for the system to collapse, nor preparing a new economic structure to replace it. It will not go until the workers determine that it shall go, and the pressing service revolutionary organisations can perform is to prepare the workers' minds for the possibility of the immediate establishment of Socialism. To return to Palme Dutt's analogy, we have not yet reached the stage of convincing the worker that there is anything wrong with the house at all; he still thinks it is the unneighbourliness of the people upstairs or in the house next door.

H.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 8d. extra.
To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant
London, W.C.1.

COMMON-SENSE OR SUPER-SENSE.

Some people might argue that there is no such thing as common sense, or sense which is common to everybody, and that, consequently, the term common sense is a misnomer. They are both right and wrong, because two meanings can be read into the term. It is perfectly true that there is no sense common to everyone, but, if we regard the word "common" merely as a synonym for "ordinary" or "common-place" as distinguished from extraordinary, the term at once becomes intelligible, because it is a well-known fact that only a small minority of the people can lay claim to a wide general knowledge. The great majority are more or less ignorant of advanced knowledge and science, and are, therefore, compelled to think and reason on the facts in their immediate environment. The bulk of society are common people and possess only common sense. According to certain apostles of the great man theory, there are in any period of history supermen and men, leaders and followers, intellectual giants who unearth the secrets of nature and publish them to ordinary folk in order that they may know how to live.

The most fitting reply to the apostles of such a creed is to ask them if the "great men" are responsible for the mess in which the human race finds itself to-day. Millions of people all over the world dying of starvation while corn is burnt as fuel and fish is spread over the land as manure. millions of workers forced to starve in idleness because the land and tools required by them to produce the necessities of life for themselves are owned by a small class who will only allow them to be used when profits come to them as a result. In a word, unspeakable poverty in the presence of means and methods that could satisfy every need, could flood the world with a cornucopia of abundance.

It requires very little intelligence, combined with a practical knowledge of modern industrial methods, to see that unemployment, poverty and war are the results of a system of production and distribution based on the class ownership of the means of life, and production for profits; and that a system based on common ownership of the

means of life with associated production for use, would not only abolish these evils but would entirely eliminate the competitive struggle for existence, or supremacy, as we know it under Capitalism.

Notwithstanding the simplicity and correctness of the Socialist position the "supermen," with all their knowledge are nearly always the apologists of the system of starvation and murder. They are with few exceptions to be found on the side of the ruling-class, declaring that the world is all right or that it will right itself if only the common herd will submit quietly to their toil and poverty and not attempt to interfere with the things they do not understand; if they will only consent to be ruled by those who understand the business of ruling, instead of attempting to run or direct things for themselves.

No one could, with truth, deny that many professional men and scientists to-day are as widely separated from the average man in knowledge and intelligence, as the latter is from the savages; yet every scientist who has approached the problem of poverty has failed to see the only solution—Socialism, or has purposely misrepresented it in order to mislead the workers and assist the ruling-class in suppressing it. Spencer wrote profusely on sociology, yet failed to observe facts and tendencies under his very nose. Haeckel, Lodge, Wallace, and many others could see no purpose in civilisation beyond the growing power and glory of the ruling-class and the continued servitude of the toiling millions.

Professor T. H. Huxley, in his essay, "Government: Anarchy or Regimentation," though failing to arrive at a solution, saw much more clearly than most scientists the nature of the poverty problem. He says, for instance: "What profits it to the human Prometheus that he has stolen the fire of heaven to be his servant and that the spirits of the earth and of the air obey him, if the vulture of pauperism is eternally to tear his very vitals and keep him on the brink of destruction?" And again: "No doubt, if out of a thousand men, one holds and can keep all the capital, the rest are bound to serve him or die." And yet again: "Individualism, on the other hand, admitting the inevitability of the struggle, is too apt to try to

persuade us that it is all for our good, as an essential condition of progress to higher things. But this is not necessarily true, the creature that survives a free fight only demonstrates his superior fitness for coping with free fighters—not any other kind of superiority."

But although Huxley saw clearly enough the evils of individualism, or Capitalism, like Spencer, he failed to see the remedy. Socialism, as he understood it, was State ownership, as the I.L.P. preaches it to-day; and he, quite rightly, judged this to be no solution. Where Huxley showed his inability to deal with, or understand social questions, was in attributing poverty to over-population. Obsessed with the Malthusian idea that, without competition and war, the human race would multiply until there was not standing room on the globe, he completely forgot that evolution is just as applicable to social science as physical science or biology. Huxley knew quite well that society had evolved from savagery, under different systems, up to the present. A scientific mind should not assume the end of systems when all social history is a succession of systems, but should endeavour to understand from the outstanding features and tendencies of the present system what forces are being generated by the prevailing conditions. Every system of the past is recognised by its class struggle; feudal barons and serfs, slave owners and slaves, etc.; to-day it is capitalists and wage-slaves. As all ruling-classes in the past have had to give way to the class below, who struggled against them, and as the working-class to-day is engaging ever more keenly in the struggle against the capitalist class, there is little doubt that the latter will share the same fate and that capitalism will give way to a new system more in harmony with the interests of the working-class.

Huxley failed to apply the scientific method, but what was even worse for so brilliant a scientist, he allowed himself to be confused by the Malthusian rubbish which had been exploded almost as soon as it was published by Godwin in his book "On Population," and later by Henry George in "Progress and Poverty."

Moreover, there is no doubt whatever that all the people at present living could, by their own labour, satisfy all their

wants, if it were not for the fact that the ruling class own the land and machinery of production and will not permit them to be used for that purpose, but only to obtain surplus value for themselves. Even if it were true, however, that population would increase beyond the means of subsistence under Socialism, that would be no excuse for prolonging Capitalism with its wage-slavery, unemployment, starvation, war and many other evils. Capitalism is so obviously a system of robbery—robbery of the wealth producers by an idle class—that nothing could justify its continuance once it became generally understood that all these evils were due to the system and would cease to exist under a sane system where profits were no longer the only incentive to production.

It is often said of those who are scientifically trained that they are more easily imposed upon than ordinary folk, and it would almost appear as if years spent in scientific research left the mind simple and childlike towards mundane affairs. This may be the explanation in some cases, but many scientists are on the side of the ruling-class for the same reason as the professional politician and the parson—because it pays.

Whatever the reason, it is quite obvious that the workers must not allow themselves to be confused or guided by them. The evils of Capitalism are quite plain to every man who possesses average common sense. It needs no great scientific knowledge to see that these evils are due to the system; nor does it require super men with giant intellects to tell the workers that they can achieve Socialism by first understanding it and then organising as a class to gain political control.

There is nothing in Socialist principles or objects beyond the comprehension of the average worker; but what there is must be understood by them before they can become organised to establish it.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1, when regular delivery will be arranged.

JOTTINGS.

Our readers will be deeply grieved, I am sure, to learn that the year that has just ended has been the hardest that the propertied class has ever experienced, at least, so says a writer in the "Manchester Guardian" (6/1/22). It is a most harrowing story. It seems that more old families have parted with their territorial possessions and cut themselves away from places which have been theirs for generations and generations. More heirlooms have been sold, more houses have been deserted, than ever before in the history of the class. Most humiliating of all, champagne is no longer drunk, and they are obliged to fall back on the humble whisky and soda. I cannot verify this at the moment—none of the things they have renounced have come my way, therefore I must be content to shed a tear. Poor devils!

o o o

And yet in the very same column in which this distressful state of affairs is described, we are regaled with an account of the costly New Year celebrations at the London hotels and restaurants, the lavish expenditure on set scenes and gifts for the guests. At one hotel alone 6,000 crackers were distributed to the guests. And they weren't penny ones, either! Other accounts elsewhere described the carnivals as being the rendezvous of the most elite of London society. Beautiful scenery, orchestras playing glorious music, lovely ladies with dresses and jewels costing thousands of pounds, plenty of cigars, booze and—oh! what's the use!

But before I leave the subject, perhaps I ought to mention, by way of contrast, that in one district alone—Poplar—10,000 very poor children were provided with a dinner by means of charity. The fact that this number of working-class children, in one district alone, could be found who were in need of something to eat, while at the other end of the town thousands of idlers were gorging themselves to death, forms a very striking commentary, indeed.

o o o

At the time of writing there is some talk of postponing the General Election which was forecasted for February. Most

political parties are preparing for the fray. The Right Hon. J. M. Robertson has written a pamphlet in the cause of the true Liberals. He calls it "Liberalism and Labour," and makes the bold claim that Liberalism "has wrought for Britain an ever-increasing liberty of life with an ever advancing betterment." Yes, we've noticed it! "It has steadily and successfully aimed at the betterment of the life conditions of the mass." Maybe. They might have aimed at it, but they have certainly missed it, for they are notoriously bad shots. Lloyd George!

The Labour Party in particular is sanguine of success. They expect to run about 400 candidates in the hope of realising their ambition—a Labour Parliament. No programme has been decided on as yet. But judging by the pronouncements made already it will differ in no respect from that of the Liberals. Ireland, reconstruction in Europe, substantial and progressive disarmament, recognition of Germany and Russia—all these non-working class issues will be the main planks in the programme.

Workers have suffered untold miseries under capitalist domination; under a Labour Government they will continue. One can easily imagine the capitalists, in order to ease their own responsibilities, handing over the reins of government to the Labour Party with their best wishes for success. We have seen what has happened under "Labour's rule" in Australia. Capitalism in this country has little to fear from the present form of industrial and political organisation of labour. Since their own existence as a class is not seriously threatened, they could rest assured that the Labour Party would do its best to clean up the rotten mess which between them they have made.

o o o

Proof of this was given by Mr. Clynes himself when speaking at a Labour Conference at Plymouth on December 10 last. He said that the Government, since the end of the war, had stumbled from one economic blunder to another, until now six or seven millions were existing under conditions of acute distress on the labour of other people instead of being at work and living on the results of their own labour. The bluff in this will be seen where he tries to make it

appear that those who are out of work are living on those who are in work. Government doles and allowances and the like, are paid out of the surplus value possessed by the capitalists; what the workers get in the form of wages represents their cost of subsistence.

Beyond that they have nothing to pay with. If the capitalists are obliged to feed their surplus slaves it is the fault of their own system. The implication in Clynes' statement is that if all those who at present are unemployed were found work, those who are now at work would be better off by as much as it is costing to keep alive those who are out of work. This is not true.

o o o

Again: "If political relations with any other country will limit our freedom for economic recovery, freedom must be secured to avoid economic ruin. By separate action, or better still, by international conference and co-operation" (i.e., of capital and labour!) "we should speedily diminish the appalling list of our unemployed. Business men and financiers now see that they must take some step to solve this question, or it will submerge them in the privations which others now endure."

You see the drift! Worrying about what *might* happen to the capitalists if they don't get busy and squeeze the worker some more!

o o o

It has been complained that the Labour Party never made Socialism the issue at an election. That's true. It would be absurd to expect it. After what has been said it will be obvious that we have some justification for saying that the Labour Party is saturated with capitalist notions.

Permit me to inflict Clynes on you once more:—"The share of Labour in providing a remedy would be in increasing the national products by greater output, so as to reach those lower prices which are a guarantee for effective competition. A demand for output should, however, be preceded by a foreign and home policy which would not destroy markets, but make them certain, and output should be preached together with the doctrine that men doing

their best shall not thereby incur the penalty of unemployment, and shall have their fair share of the increased product from increased energy." Could anything be plainer than that?

Increased production so as to reach lower prices! Lower prices, in the present condition of the labour market, mean lower wages; in some cases to below the subsistence point.

Greater output means intenser exploitation. "There is imminent in capital an inclination and constant tendency to heighten the productiveness of labour, in order to cheapen commodities, and by such cheapening, to cheapen the labourer himself" ("Capital," p. 309). It is being proved every day. Only recently a Sheffield inventor was reported to have sold to a well-known Birmingham concern for £5,000 a mass output machine which produces at 7d. per pair scissors which to-day cost Sheffield makers 3s. 6d. It is claimed that the machine, operated by one man and a boy, does the work of ten men employed on former processes.

This is what Clynes is in reality advocating, whether he realises its significance or not. And who will determine when a man is "doing his best" and what constitutes the "fair share" of the increased product from increased energy?

o o o

If we are to believe reports from Russia, the conditions in some of the outlying districts must be terrible indeed. According to correspondents who claim to have witnessed the sufferings of the people, peasants have been reduced to the necessity of eating their horses, dogs and cats, out of sheer starvation. Even rats have been utilised as food. Whether our "smart society," ever on the look-out for stunts, regards this as a novelty worthy of emulation, or not, I am unable to say. Anyway, they have made a start. We read that frogs and snails have been put on the bill of fare at one of the leading London hotels.

I looked again, thinking it might have been advanced as a measure of economy. But no—the explanation is that English and American officers have acquired a taste for them while serving in France (where others acquired a taste for something else) and are anxious to have them again.

There is no doubt that what one class would only resort to out of necessity, another class will adopt because it is "daring" and "quite the thing, you know."

But seemingly it has another aspect. According to the "Manchester Guardian" (13/1/22) "the tremendous commercial fact is that 250 frogs and 200 snails are now being brought to London daily by air from Paris." What is more, the daily order is going to be doubled because the idea has caught on. No expense will be spared so that they shall live like storks. Anything, I suppose, to relieve the monotony of a satiated useless existence. And these are our rulers—our decadent ruling class!

TOM SALA.

A STRIKING COINCIDENCE.

Although written by a man who lived too early to have studied Marx (and who, in addition, stated he was no economist, and merely wished to learn from the public men of his day) the following analysis of the causes of the misery following upon the close of the Napoleonic wars is as applicable in its main points to-day as when written over a hundred years ago:

"I said the cause of this apparently unaccountable distress seemed to me to be the new extraordinary changes which had occurred during so long a war, when men and materials had been for a quarter of a century in such urgent demand, to support the waste of our armies and navies upon so extensive a scale for so long a period. All things had attained to war prices, and these had been so long maintained, that they appeared to the present generation the natural state of business and public affairs. The want of hands and materials, with the lavish expenditure, created a demand for and gave great encouragement to new mechanical inventions and chemical discoveries, to supersede manual labour in supplying the materials required for warlike purposes, and these, direct and indirect, were innumerable. The war was a great and most extravagant customer to farmers, manufacturers, and other producers of wealth, and many during this period became very wealthy. The expenditure of the last year of the war for this country alone was one hundred and thirty millions sterling, or an excess of

eighty millions of pounds sterling over the peace expenditure. And on the day on which peace was signed, this great customer of the producers died, and prices fell as the demand diminished, until the prime cost of the articles required for war could not be obtained. The barns and farmyards were full, warehouses loaded, and such was our artificial state of society that this very superabundance of wealth was the sole cause of the existing distress. Burn the stock in the farmyards and warehouses, and prosperity would immediately recommence in the same manner as if the war had continued. This want of demand at remunerating prices compelled the master producers to consider what they could do to diminish the amount of their productions and the cost of producing until these surplus stocks could be taken off the market. To effect these results, every economy in producing was resorted to, and men, being more expensive machines for producing than mechanical and chemical inventions and discoveries, so extensively brought into action during the war, the men were discharged, and the machines were made to supersede them, while the numbers unemployed were increased by the discharge of men from the Army and Navy.

Hence the great distress for want of work among all classes whose labour was so much in demand while the war continued. This increase of mechanical and chemical power was continually diminishing the demand for and value of manual labour, and would continue to do so, and would effect great changes throughout society. For the new power created by these new inventions and discoveries was already enormous, and was superseding manual power."—Robert Owen (page 171, "Life of Robert Owen," Bohn's Popular Library.)

£1,000 FUND.

We have been asked to announce that a

GRAND OPERA-LECTURE

"LA BOHEME" (with Selections),

will be given by MOSES BARITZ,

At Fairfax Hall, Portland Gardens, Harringay,
on February 26th, 1922.

ADMISSION FREE. Doors open 7 p.m.

Proceeds of Collection to be given to the £1,000
Fund of S.P.G.B.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 3s. 0d.
Six Months, post free... .. 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY



FEB. 4, 1922

HOPE SPRINGS INFERNAL IN THE WORKER'S BREAST.

The present and future outlook of the working class is extremely gloomy—as gloomy as the murky London fog outside the writer's window this Sunday afternoon.

Prices are still in cloudland, whilst wages are falling rapidly. Unemployment engulfs a vast mass of the working class, whilst the movement for increased production (which in effect means both a lowering of wages and a lowering in the number of wage receivers) promises to further increase the workless army.

One country after another has reached the point where it can tackle its own market and compete in foreign markets. The economic signs and portents point to increasing difficulties and increasing misery for the workers of this country. England is no longer the predominant manufacturing and transportation country. In any case, so much have the one time backward countries developed that the predominance of one of them would help such a one but little. The "Good Old Times" have fled, never to return.

Backward countries have stepped into the van of production and can meet, to a great extent, their own requirements; this limits the available world's markets. But

such countries also step in as competitors in foreign markets; this further curtails the available markets. This all-round competition intensifies the struggle for markets and brings about a greater concentration upon the question of lowering the cost of production of articles.

Looking at the matter casually, to-day it would appear that the main objective of the capitalists is increased production. A closer examination of the matter will easily dispose of this false idea.

What are the elements required in order to produce wealth to-day? Raw material, machinery, and labour-power of various degrees of skill. Is there any shortage of raw material? The earth is teeming with raw material, and the untapped resources are as relatively unlimited as the development of human ingenuity. Is there a shortage of machinery? There are numerous first-class manufactories of all classes of machinery working short time for want of orders to execute. Is there a shortage of labour-power? The hundreds of thousands of unemployed of all degrees of skill searching anxiously, and so often unavailingly, for work can provide a complete answer to this question. Finally, the slowing down of production owing to overstocked markets is the overwhelming contradiction to the claims of the increased productionists.

The mere increase of production is not the objective of the capitalist; his main objective is the lowering of the cost of production. This point merits a little examination.

The cost of production of an article is determined by the amount of labour-power required, under certain definite conditions, to produce (to be more accurate—reproduce) it. Labour-power itself is subject to the same condition, under capitalism. The worker receives, as a rule, the equivalent of his cost of production, but not the equivalent of what he produces. The difference between what the worker receives and what he produces is surplus value—or that portion of the value of an article which the worker produces for nothing.

The capitalist in competing for markets endeavours to undersell competitors by reducing the labour time spent upon articles to a minimum (reducing the value of an article) and at the same time to obtain the maximum of surplus value by increasing the difference between what the worker receives

and what he produces—increasing the amount of wealth a worker can produce and reducing the amount he receives. In other words, increasing the exploitation of the worker.

The wealth the capitalist waxes fat upon comes out of surplus value, hence what the capitalist is after is not the supplying of the world with as great a multitude and variety of goods as possible, but the expansion of surplus value to the greatest possible extent. That he appears to do the former is not due to his philanthropy or good intentions, but because of his thirst for surplus value.

The capitalist is out to relieve the workers as much as possible of the burden of producing (not by shouldering it himself!). This is a very laudable object—very laudable indeed—but unfortunately it is only by shouldering the burden of producing that the worker can get his living under capitalism. Consequently by reducing the cost of production the capitalist relieves more and more workers of the burden of producing, the unemployed army grows, and in due time the graves get more and more burdens. Of course this increases employment in the coffin trade—perhaps this is the real meaning of "increased production"?

We are continually reading the inky wails of the English capitalists over the loss of trade, and the reason they put forward as causing this loss is the alleged relatively high working costs, endeavouring to impress upon us that high working costs are due to relatively high wages. We have seen above the idea lying behind their agitation, but there is another counter to their move, and that is this: The capitalists in every advanced country in the world are putting exactly the same position to their particular workers—they can't all be right! Unfortunately, however, the argument, backed up by "trusted labour leaders," serves its purpose to some extent. The workers give credence to this view and submit to wage reductions in a more or less docile manner.

In view of the obvious facts above mentioned in relation to the increase in unemployment, it is remarkable to find what a considerable number of workers base their hopes upon an improvement in their industrial outlook. They accept, without exami-

nation, the contention that they are suffering one of the usual periods of "bad times" which will shortly blow over and work will become plentiful. They forget that with the development of capitalism the "bad times" period has tended more and more to become the normal position; the intensified production spur applied during the war exaggerated the position beyond the normal growth.

So satisfactory, from the outlook of the capitalist, is the present attitude of the workers that a leading capitalist paper can say:

"The patience which in these circumstances, the masses of unemployed have maintained in the face of hardship and official apathy, is remarkable enough to have excited the astonishment of visitors from abroad as well as writers in other countries" (*Daily News*, 13/10/21).

And the Communist, the closet philosophers (!) have the blindness or the brazen impudence to assert that this country is on the verge of revolution!

Hope may "spring eternal in the human breast," but when directed into certain channels it is not only as delusive as the desert mirage, but it is also apt to bring harmful results—in the case in question the hope of "Better Times" breeds the attitude of political apathy.

Outside of Socialism there are no "Better Times" ahead for the working class. Consequently the workers must abandon their present apathetic attitude and take a lively interest in their present social position—they must study Socialism and find out what it means to them.

NOW ON SALE.**MANIFESTO**

OF
THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc. ::

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE

S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1

CAPITALISM IN EAST AFRICA.

(continued.)

Some, at least, of the natives are beginning to have other ideas. Native associations with a strong political bias already exist, and have, during the past year, been steadily attracting attention by open propaganda.

On June 24th representatives of the Kikuyu Association met the Chief Native Commissioner and his underling, the Senior Commissioner of the Kyambu District (the heart of the coffee area). Through the instrumentality of certain missionaries (obviously desirous of keeping native movements in "constitutional" lines), they laid before these officials a memorandum of grievances under ten heads, which are worth quoting in detail.

(1) The Tribal Retainers were charged with conscripting young females (married and single) for labour on European plantations by coercing the chiefs, parents, or husbands, as the case might be, with fines and imprisonment. (Tribal Retainers are native police agents of the Government operating in the tribal reserves.) It was pointed out that this practice led to wholesale degradation of the girls and young women at the hands of overseers, etc., on the plantations. Specific instances were given, but, of course, the Government Officers could not be expected to know anything about them officially, although they are the logical outcome of measures such as the Labour Ordinance.

(2) It was charged against the Administration that Chiefs and Headmen were arbitrarily arrested and imprisoned without the "Kiama" (native council of elders) being informed of any charge of offence against them.

(3) Charges of corruption, extortion, rape, etc., were proffered against the Chief Tribal Retainer, and supported by numerous concrete instances.

(4) Complaint was made that, in spite of Government's promises to issue title deeds to the natives for the land held, occupied, and cultivated by them, encroachments of a piecemeal character upon such land are continually occurring.

(5) The delegation protested against the registration system. The registration certificate of each native employee must be signed by his employer before he may leave

the latter's service. An employer who wishes to retain natives who may wish to leave him can simply refuse to sign their certificates.* By leaving under such circumstances the employees render themselves open to prosecution for desertion.

(6) It was pointed out that the heavy increase in taxation, coupled with the reduction of wages, was very oppressive.

(7) The Government were pointedly reminded that they promised the natives "rewards" for their services during the war. Was the policy above outlined to be considered as the reward?

(8) Free access to the forests (of which the natives have been deprived by law) was demanded. "We now have to buy the firewood and trees (for building) which once were ours."

(9) The arbitrary manner in which "the Europeans"—i.e., the settlers and the Government discussed and adopted measures vitally affecting native interests—was strongly condemned, and a demand was made for what is virtually political representation.

(10) Finally, the delegation made it clear that they were not satisfied simply to work and pay taxes, and claimed universal education for their children at Government expense!

To the critical wage-slave of Europe the above expression of native thought may not appear very revolutionary. The evils described are essentially similar to those which he has become accustomed to regard as inseparable from the social order under which he exists; while the demands in the final clauses can hardly affect that order in a fundamental manner in Africa, seeing that they have not done so in Europe. Yet to the local master class these demands appear as drastic as did Chartism to their early Victorian prototypes, and any independent effort of the natives to realise them will be fought and, if possible, crushed.

It is here that the importance of the political struggle of the Indian bourgeoisie becomes manifest. That they will use (already are using) the discontent of the native peasantry and the ever-growing proletariat as a lever to achieve their aims is only to be expected by those possessed of historical knowledge. It is just as certain that the sympathy of the Asiatic

*NOTE.—These Certificates bear (among other particulars) the native's thumb-print.

leaders for the natives will evaporate as rapidly as their own objects are conceded, i.e., equality for capitalists irrespective of colour! But the ghost of democracy once raised is not so easily laid. Two parties can play the demagogues game. If, as seems likely, the white settlers also adopt the weapon of popular agitation, then the natives may reap from the quarrel of their rival exploiters the concession of formal political power. By bringing them into line with other slaves this will make them more accessible to real revolutionary propaganda. It is the fear of this ultimate result of the Indian agitation that is at the back of the settlers' minds, and adds intensity to their resistance. They feel quite capable of dealing with the natives so long as the latter are isolated, but once let the natives obtain an inkling of the forces at work in the outside world and the settlers may well tremble for the safety of their privileges.

This is typical bourgeois blindness. As Marx has it:—"The progress of social disintegration will take a form more brutal or more humane, according to the degree of development of the working class itself" (Preface to "Capital," 1st Edn.). Native discontent in Africa will only take on a more violent and reckless character the more it is debarred from scientific enlightenment; but it is hardly surprising that the intellectual paralysis of the capitalist class should extend itself to their representatives in the tropics. Only from the working class is the native likely to receive aid in developing in a full and free manner both himself and his natural heritage, and it is the writer's purpose to show that the workers have a direct interest in that development, or, to be more precise, will have, so soon as they emancipate themselves from capitalist control.

Before the rise of Capitalism in Europe the workers found almost within the bounds of their villages (or at most their counties) the means of satisfying most of their wants. To be sure they might (when in a position to do so) enjoy the luxuries produced by foreign lands; but to the workers to-day the outside world is not primarily a source of luxury. It is an indispensable necessity. Elements from every longitude and latitude enter into the environment of even the wage-slaves, and

it is this fact which inspires the Socialist slogan, "The World for the Workers!"

In order to find raw material for its ever-expanding industry and even food for its increasing army of industrial labour-power, Capitalism has annihilated geographical and racial boundaries and enslaved to some degree the mass of practically every people on earth. It has turned Asia, Africa, Australia, and South America into agricultural and mining districts of North America and Europe. It has destroyed such degree of domestic industry as existed in these continents and thus made them dependent on Capitalism for finished commodities; thus providing itself with the indispensable condition of its own growth—an expanding world-market.

The workers have suffered most from every crisis through which Capitalism has passed. They are suffering most now. It is upon them, therefore, that the world-problem presses most relentlessly for solution. That solution can be found only in the abolition of capitalist ownership of the means of life and production for profit. A system in which the producers have social utility as their object, in which, therefore, every pair of hands, every brain, every available material resource is welcome, nay, necessary—only such a system, based on common ownership of the world, common rights and common duties, can solve the problem. The African problem, the Indian problem (and the Irish problem) are all aspects of the whole; they will find their solution—can find no other solution than—in the world solution. The workers of Europe and America will find in the slaves of Asia and Africa allies in the struggle against Capitalism, but being the industrial proletariat they must take the lead. Their superior historical experience and technical resources must provide the means to guide and train willing but inarticulate helpers in the task of revolutionary reconstruction. A world-wide propaganda, coupled with every possible material assistance, must supersede the political control of the master-class.

Only thus can the workers make the most of the world and their own inherited mechanical and intellectual powers. The emancipation of the working-class involves the emancipation of all mankind!

E. B.

MORE "CHEAP AND NASTY."

In the "Fortnightly Review" for November appears an article entitled "Unemployment—its cause and its only remedy." The alluring title might lead the unsuspecting to anticipate something in the nature of a new remedy, but upon a little examination, we find it is simply the old speeding up trick of increased production. Every mouthpiece of capital, be it Clynes on the stump, Lloyd George at the Guildhall Banquet, or even a capitalist apologist prostituting his pen in a four shilling periodical, each in their turn have denounced the workers and attempted to show that theirs is the responsibility for the present universal chaos. The writer of the above article, Ellis J. Barker, says: "Industrial unemployment is world-wide, and it is due principally to the unreasonableness of labour" (p. 870). "It is by far the greatest in England and the United States, in both countries industry has almost come to a standstill owing to the vast accumulation of manufactured goods which fill the warehouses and cannot be sold" (p. 869). This condition of world-wide super-abundance of goods co-existent with millions of workless men and women, is, we claim, the logical outcome of capitalist production, its effects are as wide as the system itself. Just so long as production is primarily for the world's markets with the object of profit, just so long must this absurdity, want amidst an overflowing supply of man's requirements, persist. Many generations have passed away since man's power over nature made slavery possible, that condition came into existence as soon as his product exceeded his individual needs. A meagre subsistence that barely sufficed for the needs of all, made idlers and thus slavery impossible. But to-day mankind has inherited all the age long discoveries and inventions that have culminated in the vast social productive powers of modern machine industry, which in comparison to all previous methods of wealth production, appear as mere button pressing. Only a class ignorant of its own importance could operate and yield such forces, merely to live in want, wretchedness and degradation. And yet out of these conditions will arise the knowledge that will lead to the eventual determination to end this sordid existence and in its place establish

a system of society that will mean life in the fullest sense. Writers of the type of Ellis J. Barker pretend to be innocent of the nature of capitalist exploitation. They ignore causes and pretend that symptoms are only passing inconveniences that will fade away if only the workers will work harder and be more sweetly reasonable. He says: "There is a superabundance of work for all. The world has never been in more urgent need for goods of every kind" (p. 877). One would naturally ask why there are any unemployed, or why the goods "which fill the warehouses and cannot be sold." We have already answered these questions, when we pointed out that production is only carried on for sale; when that sale is impossible then the workers remain idle and in want. The wages they receive represent but a fraction of the total values they produce, and no matter how cheaply they produce, or how cheaply they live, they cannot buy back more than that portion equal in value to their wages which represent only a part of their output. Even the luxurious living of the idle class can only account for a portion of this surplus, still leaving an enormous quantity of wealth seeking a market. Newly developed countries like Japan mean lost customers and new competitors for these markets. It isn't by any wish of the capitalist that he groans under the depressing atmosphere of prolonged crises that apparently refuse to clear away. Unemployment is a necessity of capitalism at any time, both for the lowering of wages and to ensure as far as possible the continued docility and forbearance of its wage slaves. It exists where increased production has taken place; it exists where low wages are paid, and where a relatively higher wage operates; it is as much an institution of capitalism as poverty, prostitution, or the Nonconformist conscience. Only when the working-class understand the cause of unemployment and all the other vicious conditions which beset the workers' existence; understand that the cause is capitalism itself can they harmonise social production with social ownership by the abolition of the private ownership of the means of life, and the establishment of the social ownership. This will bring the ownership of wealth in line with the social methods of production of to-day, whose benefits at present accrue only to the

privileged few. Then only will such powers of wealth production beneficially serve the whole of society and bring happiness and plenty to all.

MAC.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Sirs,—In the S.S. for December, 1921, at the foot of page 51, Mr. Tom Sala quotes—apparently with disapproval—the statement—

"Matter as now viewed by science is something as little materialistic in the old sense as could be well imagined"

and, on page 54 is an article by "S." entitled "Ghosts."

I have never been able to understand why readers of the S.S. have uninformed stuff of this sort occasionally flung at their heads, seeing that the proletariat is wholly indifferent to philosophy, advanced physics or psychic science.

However, as space is allotted in your journal to these topics, may I ask Mr. Sala one or two questions?

- (1) What is "matter" as distinct from force?
- (2) How can "matter" (as distinct from force) effect sensation in us, and so apprise us of its existence?

Yours faithfully,

GEO. T. FOSTER.

Reply.

Comrades,—Mr. Foster appears to have missed the point of my comment. My reason for quoting and commenting on the observation was to show that in the field of science, as anywhere else, the workers were being bluffed. Hence, as a Socialist, my disapproval.

The term "materialistic" in the quotation given was used by its author deprecatingly, suggesting that materialism in the "old sense" (meaning that of Spencer, Haeckel, Büchner, etc.) had had its day and that the metaphysicians had now something to say. Taken with its context, where it went on to say that "true science did not seek to deprive man of his soul, or to drive the Creator from His Universe," its meaning should have been obvious.

Conceptions of matter may have changed, but no scientist, with any regard

for the facts, can say that matter is any less materialistic than it ever was. Admitting that the old views of matter required modification, to say that matter as now viewed by science is less materialistic, and that it can find a place for God and the soul, is both unscientific and misleading.

If I understand Mr. Foster to mean that these things are of no importance to the cause of the workers, then I venture to disagree with him. If, also, he means that there are subjects which are outside the interests of the proletariat, and to which it would be futile to give them access, again I disagree. It may be true that they are indifferent to scientific subjects; but don't we find, as teachers of Socialism, that they are not only indifferent to our teaching, but are indifferent to their own poverty! But that does not mean we should abandon the task, surely! Mr. Foster's gibe suggests that I did wrong in selecting the statement quoted for comment. Assuming I am "uninformed," he thereupon proceeds to test my knowledge by submitting the following questions:—

- (1) What is "matter" as distinct from force?

Ans.: I don't know. If by "force" is meant energy (since "force" has no physical existence), then matter as distinct from energy (or "force") is an unthinkable proposition. I am aware that these are spoken of as "entities," yet we are told that each is known only in its relation to the other. We may know something of the constituents or properties of matter, but as to what matter itself is—does anyone know?

- (2) How can "matter" (as distinct from force) effect sensation in us, and so apprise us of its existence?

Ans.: This starts with the same proposition as No. 1. It is, therefore, covered by the answer to No. 1. Perhaps some person less "uninformed" than myself would like to get busy on this.

After all, the Editor's space is limited, if the Universe isn't.

Yours fraternally,

TOM SALA.

Dear Sir,—Referring to the allusion on page 63 of the SOCIALIST STANDARD to the "Crusader," will you allow me to say that Mr. Wellock, who is quoted, no longer contributes to the "Crusader," and that his withdrawal from our regular staff was due to differences on the very points raised by your contributor. The charge of inconsistency therefore fails. There is an article in our current issue in which our standpoint is made clear. Referring to a book by Maurice L. Rowntree on Social Freedom, our reviewer says:—

"It is unfortunate, too, that once more the impressions should be given that the Social Message of Christianity rests ultimately on the teaching of Jesus instead of on the basic facts of revelation—i.e., the incarnation, sacrifice, and resurrection of Christ. When St. Paul wished to impress on his readers the need of cultivating the spirit of service he did not refer to the teaching of Jesus but to the fact that He Who was equal with God "humbled Himself and became obedient unto death." For those who regard Jesus only as a supreme prophet, Mr. Rowntree's method may seem satisfactory, but for those who hold the Christian Faith nothing less than that Faith will serve as a sufficient foundation and guide for their social programme."

It may interest your readers that Conrad Noel, Vicar of Thaxted, is now contributing to the "Crusader" his "People's Life of Jesus."

Yours sincerely,
STANLEY B. JAMES.

Mr. James states that Wilfred Wellock, from whom I quoted, has left the "Crusader." I wrote, however, at the end of September, more than a month, I believe, before Wellock left.

I had not made a specific charge of inconsistency, but I will certainly make it now. It is inconsistent to have conflicting opinions published side by side without one or the other being accepted as an official view.

It does not seem to me that the "Personal Divinity of Christ" touches on the question of the emancipation of the working class, but the offering of Christian slave ethics to a subject class whose end can be achieved only through a bitter struggle, does touch on it—dangerously.

Incidentally, there is in a recent issue a repetition of this idea. "Christians . . . could become helpful critics of the trade unions. Were they alive to the ultimate and deathless realities of love, justice and equality, they would bring alert criticism from inside when material questions of wages were obscuring the spiritual question of revolution." (30th December, 1921).

The question of revolution is not a spiritual one. Its means is the wresting of political control from the Capitalist class, and its object the freeing of the workers from economic subjection. It will be met with hatred, and has nothing to do with abstract justice. The expropriation of private property will in fact be, for the present owners, a most unjust proceeding. Capitalist equality, that is, the equality before the law, of Capitalists in the exploitation of the workers, is desirable—for the exploiters. Might not right well prevail against them. H.

POCKET AND PRINCIPLE.

"Beware of all other classes."—"No matter whom it shuts out, go through with, it—make them line up with the worker . . . or else shut the door on them." . . . "If a man is a member of the B.S.P., the S.P.G.B., the Herald League, the Salvation Army, the Anarchists, no matter what organisation or group, if his income is more than £5 weekly . . . he is not a member of your class." (E. T. Whitehead, the "Spur," June, 1920.)

Whitehead did not explain who were "all the other classes." He also did not attempt to support this weird idea of his by evidence, but palmed it off on poor old Marx. The sequel, however, is amusing.

Since those days Edgar appears to have prospered. He is now the employee of the Communist Party, that curious compound of the "B.S.P., the Herald League, the Salvation Army," etc., etc. He has also passed the £5 line, which for him parts the sheep from the goats. "Change the manner of getting the living . . . from working to cadging . . . the ideas change at once." ("Spur," as above.)

Are Whitehead's words to be applied to himself, and is this the reason why our wartime pacifist is now a full-blooded Bolshevik?

The "Herald" completes the chapter. A New York report in the issue for 14th January, 1922, reads as follows:—

"Edgar T. Whitehead . . . the representative of the Communist Party of Great Britain on the Workers' International Famine Relief Committee . . . arrived as a first class passenger aboard the "Baltic." (Italics mine.)

R. BIRD.

THE COAL MINER AND HIS UNION.

We remember a glowing eulogy of Frank Hodges appearing in the daily Press at the time of the coal strike, 1920.

An immediate reason for "pointing him out" arises from the following statement he is reported to have made ("Daily News," 14/1/22) on the miners' plight and low wages.

"Those who are working, are working with unprecedented energy, but the pithead prices secured for the coal does not warrant either a decent wage for the workmen, nor anything like a fair measure of profit to the owners; although the industrial consumer and the domestic consumer are still having to pay fabulously high prices for the coal after it has passed through the hands of merchants, factors, and retail dealers."

Why should Hodges be concerned about "a fair measure of profit to the owner"? What are profits? They represent a portion of surplus value, unpaid labour time.

The workers are poor because they are robbed of this surplus value. The workers receive back only a relatively small proportion of the values they produce. They are paid wages on the subsistence level, the sliding scale system. The worker has but his power to labour, which, in order to live he is compelled to offer for the best terms he can obtain.

His labour power is a commodity, and like every other commodity, its price is determined, in the main, by its cost of production, the price fluctuating through the operations of supply and demand. Therefore, the cost of purchasing the necessities of life—food, clothing, and shelter—determines as a rule the amount of wages which the worker receives from time to time.

Now Hodges knows that the wages system spells misery to the worker and he clouds the situation with his talk of "decent wages" and "a fair measure of profit."

O.C.I.

OUR THOUSAND POUND FUND.

Already acknowledged £692 11 10½	
By Donations: (5) "W.H." £3 0 0	
Tottenham Branch ...	1 0 0
Islington Branch ...	1 0 0
Mrs. Revelle ...	1 1 0
Mrs. C. and G. ...	1 0 0
J.C.C. ...	1 10 0
J. W. Elliott, Australia ...	1 6 6
F. Sutherland, Queensland ...	2 0 0
"A.H." ...	1 0 0
E. Littler 9/-; E. Pilgrim 9/6 ...	0 18 6
E. Fairbrother 20/-; L. Fairbrother 10s. ...	1 10 0
T. W. M., 2/-; H.B., 12/8; Fincham, 2/6; Bunny, 5/- ...	1 2 6
C.W.A., 1/-; C.J.M., 1/- (Hackney) ...	0 2 0
	16 10 6
By Collecting Sheet: M/C Br. (441) ...	0 7 6
Sale of: Gloves and Collars, 5/-; Books, 2/1; on a/c Gramophone, 5/- ...	0 12 1
£1,000 Fund Stamps:	
"W.H.," 68 ...	1 0 0
Swansea (U.V.W.), 21 ...	1 0 0
G/K., 75 ...	1 0 0
N.W.L. Br., 81 ...	1 0 0
Batt. Br., 50 ...	1 0 0
McC., 72 ...	1 0 0
	6 0 0
B/N ...	0 10 0
M/U, 71 ...	0 7 0
Cam' Town (U.V.W.) ...	0 4 0
Battersea, Br.: 23, 2/-; 47, 2/3; 48, 4/-; 49, 10/-; ...	0 18 3
Birmingham Br.: 86, 2/-; 88, 1/-; 90, 5/- ...	0 8 0
Islington Br.: 22, 6d.; 41, 4/6 ...	0 5 0
N.W.L. Br.: 13, 11/-; 15, 3/6 ...	0 14 6
Tottenham Br.: 10, 10/-; 11, 2/6; 61, 6d. ...	0 13 0
Walthamstow Br.: 53, 8/-; West Ham Br.: 16, 7/6; 17, 1/-; 18, 1/-; 19, 10/-; 21, 3/- ...	1 2 6
	5 10 3
Proceeds from Subscribers' Dance ...	4 5 7
	£725 17 9½

Will sympathisers of the Party in GLASGOW

desirous of forming a Branch in that district communicate with

H. J. WATSON,
5, Elliot St., Glasgow.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spiceal-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Sec., 142 Bulwer-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER.—Communications to Sec., J. Lloyd, 2 Chapel-st., Chester-rd., Hulme, Manchester.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Monday at 7, at 107, Charlotte Street, W.1. Communications to Sec., 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. Discussion after branch business.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 3, Lyveden-rd., Tooting, S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays, at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 19, Beechfield-rd., Finsbury Pk., N.4. Branch meets Saturdays 8.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Edmonton, Silver Street, 11.30 a.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Stratford, Vicarage-lane, 7.30 p.m.
Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 a.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m.
Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.
Wimbledon Broadway, 8 p.m.

Fridays:

Tottenham, Junction Clyde-road and Phillip-lane, 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.
Tooting, Undine-street, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.; and
Printed by R. E. TAYLOR & SON, LTD., 55/57, Banner Street, London, E.C.1.

**THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.****OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No 211. Vol. 18.]

LONDON, MARCH, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.

WHERE PRIVATE PROPERTY DOES NOT REIGN

Socialism stands for a society of equals in which the distinctions between rich and poor, exploiters and exploited, no longer exist. Opponents of this revolutionary conception assure us frequently that no such form of society has ever existed, or ever will; that there always have been rich and poor, and always will be, and so on. The following is an attempt to show this statement to be false by depicting the social conditions obtaining amongst the native races of the interior of Africa prior to the European invasion. This invasion having taken place (so far as the countries known as Kenya and Uganda are concerned) during the past generation only, living evidence of previous conditions still exists. It takes the form of customs not yet entirely abandoned, of institutions not yet completely destroyed, and, above all, of the wonderful memories of the old men of the tribes, memories which, of necessity, are enhanced and sharpened by the absence of any literature of native origin.

The evidence above described has been the subject of much investigation on the part of Government officials, missionaries, and travellers in the course of their occupations, some of which has found expression in book form. To this the present writer is much indebted; but the key to the understanding of native life was supplied to him by one (Lewis H. Morgan) who actually had very little knowledge of Africa; for the obvious reason that it had hardly been opened up at the time he wrote his master-work, "Ancient Society." This speaks volumes for the thoroughness with which Morgan dug to the foundations of barbaric society.

He discovered that among the American Indians the clan (or gens) was the central institution of society, the pivot on which turned the customs and beliefs of the people. He further showed that the same condition had obtained in ancient Greece and Rome before the development of political society, that is, society founded on economic classes; and also among the barbaric races of Northern Europe and Western Asia who subsequently came under the sway of the above Empires. The case is the same in Africa!

The essential feature of the clan is kinship, *i.e.*, its members are supposed to be descended from a common ancestor more or less remote. Being of the same blood, they may not intermarry. Each member of the clan must find his or her mate among the members of the other clans, the children ultimately becoming members of their fathers' clan. This occurs at the age of puberty, when the rite of circumcision is practised amid great ceremonial and rejoicing. Henceforth they are regarded as adults eligible for marriage. The young men at this age are trained as warriors. Their function is to protect the flocks and herds (which constitute the tangible wealth of the clans), and occasionally, when considered necessary, to undertake raiding expeditions on hostile tribes to augment this wealth.

At this age the young men and women enjoy a considerable amount of sexual freedom, which, as might be expected, gives bourgeois, who are establishing themselves there, a horrible shock and provides them with ample material for the propaganda of

measures, such as forced labour, etc., which convert the men into wages-slaves and the women into whores. Infanticide appears to be practised before marriage, but this latter state is seldom long delayed, whereupon children become an important object in life. In fact, barbaric sentiment with regard to the younger generation, only equalled by its respect for the old, surpasses anything the present writer has seen expressed among the civilised races.

The first-born child marks yet another change in the status of its father, who thereupon commences to take an active part in the administration of tribal affairs. He serves at this stage an apprenticeship, as it were, in the art of judging cases such as are brought from time to time before the council of elders, the supreme judicial authority of the tribe. A man becomes an elder upon the circumcision of the first-born. He thus enters upon the final stage of his career. Those dying before reaching this stage are exposed for the wild beasts to devour; the elders, however, are accorded burial and their spirits become the guardians of the tribe. This brings us to another aspect of native life, i.e., its religious aspect. It is difficult, however, to say just where this aspect begins and ends. Unlike the abstract religions that have succeeded it, ancestor worship is an everyday religion. From birth to death the life of the individual is hedged around with superstitious observances to secure the favour of the guardian angels and, through them, of nature, the supreme element in a social order based upon primitive modes of living. As a result there exists a hierarchy of so-called medicine-men, elders who are supposed to have special intimacy with the spiritual forces surrounding the tribe and are expected to exercise their influence for its benefit.

Mr. A. C. Hollis, in his work, "The Nandi," gives a curious instance of a chief medicine-man who was put to death by his tribesmen for being the assumed cause of a serious military disaster. Misfortune, however, of various kinds continued to dog the path of the tribes, who then, with characteristic lack of consequence, attributed this to the murder of the medicine-man!

The medicine-men share with the people at large the selection of the chiefs from among the warriors to direct military affairs, and their advice also guides the people in

the choice of times and seasons for stock movements in the case of pastoral tribes, and planting, etc., for those depending on horticulture. Thus the religious and conservative element dominates and holds together the destinies of the people, as is but natural in a State where economic conditions hardly vary from generation to generation.

Between the different leagues of tribes, or peoples, the mode of life naturally varies. Thus, in the mountain fastnesses, clad in dense forest, dwell the Wandorobo, hunters of the big game (elephant, buffalo, and the like), whose bows and poison-tipped arrows are practically their sole means of production. Out on the open plains the Masai herd their cattle, wandering from place to place according to the rainfall and the growth of grass. Among the lower hills and the valleys formed by the streams, live people like the Kikuyu, cultivating with primitive knives and hoes small patches of ground for grains, legumes, tuberous roots, plantains, etc. But although normally hostile to one another, each people recognises amongst itself the principle of common access to the means of life, i.e., the land. With the hunters and the pastoral nomads this is obvious; but even in the case of the horticultural tribes the same principle applies. The family (normally polygamous) holds from the clan sufficient land for its needs. It is entitled to that, and no more, and if by chance it dies out the land reverts to the clan.

Private property is confined to tools and domestic utensils, weapons and ornaments. These are all in such an immature state of development that it is impossible for them to form means for exploitation through monopoly. Agriculture strictly so-called (i.e., the cultivation of fields by drawn ploughs) not having arisen, the productivity of the individual is too small to make slavery a source of wealth. The slaves would produce little more than they would consume. Hence only the female sex are taken captive in battle, and they are adopted into the captor's family either as daughters or wives.

Cattle occupy a peculiar importance in native economy. Their slaughter for food is practically confined to festivals and sacrifices. Their milk, of course, is used, but their principal function seems to be to serve as equivalents to human beings. Thus, when, by marriage, a man takes a woman

from another clan, he has to compensate that clan, through the father, for the loss, with so many head of cattle. When, again, a man kills another, *of a different clan*, similar compensation must be made.

To kill a member of the same clan as himself is apparently a hopeless crime, for which no compensation can avail. The murderer becomes an outcast for the rest of his life.

After a raid the relatives of any warriors who have been slain receive, again, this same compensation. The herds are so numerous in excess of economic requirements and are distributed so liberally among the families from the heads of the clan downwards, and are, withal, regarded with such an intense sentiment, bordering on (if not actually amounting to) superstition, that they appear as a part of the tribe rather than a form of property.

Thus European civilisation has discovered in Africa a form of society somewhat similar to that examined by Morgan in America, a system in which economic classes do not exist, in which each individual becomes in turn warrior, worker, and counsellor, thus combining in his own person the social functions, the division of which, later in history, formed the basis for the origin of classes.

Some bourgeois critics, impatient for an end to this primitive form of communism, do not hesitate to describe it as the enslavement of the people by the chiefs.

Their assertions, however, are based on a very scanty acquaintance with the facts, and are effectively refuted by the painstaking literary efforts of prominent officials such as Sir Alfred Sharpe and Sir Harry Johnston, men whose life-work is the overthrow of this same communism in favour of British capitalist Imperialism, and consequently they are not prejudiced on its side.

The chiefs and elders express the unity of the clan. They have no power apart from it. They are its agents in dealing with other clans and with its individual members. Any privileges which may be incidental to their office are in the nature of special rewards for special services. They depend upon the voluntary tribute of the people and not upon any political or economic means of extortion. (Such means are a later innovation of the British Government, anxious to undermine native solidarity.) The chiefs are the creatures of the customs which they enforce; any antagonism between them is fatal

for the chief. As for the so-called subjection of the female sex, this is readily seen to be a form of division of labour dictated by the conditions of social existence. The women till the gardens, look after their houses, prepare the food, and nurse the young; but the bourgeois critic conveniently forgets that the tribes would soon expire if the male sex did not clear and break up the ground, fell the trees and build the houses, and devise and construct the tools and weapons (of iron) with which the ground is tilled and the herds protected from the wild beasts.

Still the defender of capitalism remains unsatisfied. "Even so," he will say, "admitting that society existed without economic classes for hundreds of thousands of years from the days of the ape-man to the dawn of history, granting that in that time it developed speech, discovered the art of making fire, domesticating animals, the use of grains and vegetables, and evolved from promiscuous herds to organised groups, even so, it did not produce the comfort and leisure without which art and science, in a word, civilisation, would not have come into being! To do this the subordination of the ignorant many to the intelligent few was necessary."

This admits that civilisation is based on the servitude of the people; for it is not they who enjoy comfort and leisure, art and science, although they produce these desirable conditions by their labour. They do not even obtain the same security of life as the clansman! But the same onward march of the productive forces which burst asunder the narrow communism of the past is preparing the economic basis of the world-communism of the future, i.e., enough wealth, comfort, leisure, art and science for all!

E. B.

TO PARTY MEMBERS.

A meeting of Party Members, to discuss Propaganda, will be held at the

Builders' Labourers Hall,

84, Blackfriars Road, London, S.E. 1,

on Saturday, March 18th, 1922,

at 5.30 p.m.

DOPE AND ANTI-DOPE.

" . . . Instead of combining to make the public pay an economic price for papers, they " [the newspaper proprietors] " combine to cut wages and then throw at the head of the public not only a commodity at a cost which scarcely covers productions, but also valuable prizes, insurance policies, supplements, etc., etc. The consequence is that many papers cannot pay their way. But what of that? Many papers are not intended to pay their way. If they pave the way for someone to political power, or the peerage, they will have done all that is asked of them.

" It is a curious fact, and one worth pondering deeply, that while the banks during the last year or so have held up credits for industry in general, they have allowed huge overdrafts to newspapers. (I am assuming for a moment that all the tales of woe told by newspaper proprietors are as veracious as they are pathetic.) General trade for the home markets and export have gone to rot. The banks would not finance enterprise to enable cheap textile or other goods to be made for export. But they have financed newspaper proprietors to enable them to produce cheap newspapers. Why? Is it that the bankers believe that the newspapers are necessary to instruct the public as to how it should behave, how it should think, and how it should vote? "

—General Secretary, N.U.J. "The Journalist," February, 1922.

Well, well, well! Did you know that, Mr. Worker? Did you know that many papers were not intended to pay their way? Did you know that the bankers have allowed huge overdrafts to the proprietors of newspapers to enable the papers to be sold at a price within reach of the workers?

Of a surety, do the bankers believe it is necessary for the workers to be instructed as to how they should behave, think, and vote.

And why? Well, dear worker, so long as you behave along the lines of conduct laid down by the bankers and their class, so long as you vote with them and for them, so long will they be able to maintain their position in society to the detriment of your class.

The things required to satisfy the needs of the world are to-day wrested from nature by one section of society, the working class. The other section, the master class,

appropriate the results of the workers' efforts, the wealth produced, by virtue of the fact that the workers have " behaved " and " voted " in such a way as to enable the masters so to do. Thus the master class determines who shall have, who shall have not, and in what proportion—determine who shall eat and who shall starve.

The remedy? Well, fellow-worker, you really must behave, think, and vote differently. You must think for yourself, instead of absorbing the dope dressed up to look like real knowledge. You must vote for your own class, and not that of the banker. You must see to it that your fellow-worker has the real position of the working class laid in front of him, instead of the dope issued by the banker-financed " Press " daily. THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is the instrument for your purpose ready to hand. Bring it to the notice of your mates in the mine, mill, factory, or railroad. Push its sale for all you are worth.

Written by workers for the workers, it is the safe antidote to the poison pushed into the minds of the workers. It cannot, it attempts not, to " pay-the-bill-while-you-are-ill." The STANDARD's only mission in the insurance line is to point the way to the workers by which they can insure against the evils of capitalist society, by ensuring a speedy termination of the system that robs them of the fruits of their labours.

Get on with the job, then—AT ONCE.

H. W. M.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, :: Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc. ::

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE

S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1

THE COMMUNISTS AND THE LABOUR PARTY ALLIANCE.

There has of late been much talk in Communist circles for and against assisting the Labour Party into power at the next election. The position at the moment is that the Communist Party officially favours the idea of getting inside the Labour Party, but that the latter body nationally (and often locally, too) rejects the request for permission to affiliate. There now arises the problem of whether or not the Communists are to support Labour candidates when Lloyd George thinks fit to appeal to the electorate.

In the main the Communists do not pretend to believe that the accession to power of the Labour Party will directly and of itself solve the problems facing the workers. It is true that Malone, the C.P.'s solitary M.P., is of the opinion that the " few divergences between the Communist Party and the Labour Party . . . will soon be settled by affiliation " ("Daily Herald," January 23rd), but probably the majority of the Communists who desire affiliation regard it as a tactical weapon likely to be of value to them, not as an admission that they and the Labour Party have much in common.

This kind of discussion is not new: for generations the question of alliance with capitalist political parties has agitated the minds of sections of the working class. Our attitude is clear and definite enough. We want Socialism, and we are convinced that we should not be bringing it nearer by angling for the support of anti-Socialist bodies, even although it might seem superficially that some gain would accrue.

The discussion only interests us in so far as it serves to expose the danger to the working class of following those who advocate such a course.

What is strikingly new is the claim for this idea that it has had its origin in Russia, as one of the lessons of the Revolution there. W. Paul, who for years in the S.L.P., opposed alliance with the reactionary Labour Party as a principle (although in practice joint demonstrations, etc., did take place), now that he is in the Communist Party has seen the " Light from the East " and stands forth as a convert. Lenin has taught him what his own knowledge and experience could not.

The object aimed at is, to gain the sympathy of the rank and file, discredit the

present leaders, and then capture or disrupt the party. In addition, Paul has in mind the urgency of removing the Coalition in order to save the Bolshevik Government. The Bolsheviks, fully aware at last of the futility of expecting revolution in Western Europe or America, and equally aware that they will only with difficulty maintain themselves in power in face of internal and external pressure, seek to gain relief by aiding their alleged enemies of the Labour Party to gain a Parliamentary majority.

John S. Clarke, in the "Worker" (November 26th), opposes the view point of W. Paul. He deals very successfully both with the lack of tactical value of this move, and with its history. His main arguments are that it is not new, having been tried before in this country with unfortunate results, and that the possibility is that the Bolsheviks themselves, far from having originated it, actually learned it here.

"As a political tactic it has had an interesting history and by no means successful one. Not to carry the reader too far back we see it operating in the year 1841. The Whigs and the Chartists met together in that year on the 21st January to try and arrange a ' bloc.' Three months later at a parliamentary by-election (Nottingham), the Chartists actively supported the Tory candidate, Mr. Walter, in order to deal a blow at the Whig Government."

The Chartist paper, the "Northern Star," commented as follows, says Clarke:

"It is better at all times to submit to a real despotism than to a government of perfidious, treacherous and pretended friends. We are the natural enemies of Whiggism and Toryism, but, being unable to destroy both factions, we advise you to destroy the one faction by making a tool of the other."

In 1921, eighty years after, we find the Communist Party seeking to destroy one "natural enemy" (the Coalition) by making a tool of another (the Labour Party). What 1922 will bring forth the Lord only knows.

The Chartists alternately supported Whigs and Tories, sometimes neither, and sometimes both together. In the "Northern Star," on June 12th, 1841, were two leading articles advising opposite policies. We now have the Communist Party actively opposing some Labour candidates (e.g., MacDonald at Woolwich) and taking up a non-committal attitude towards others (Naylor at Walworth).

"Chartism collapsed in 1848. The Social Democratic Federation was not born until 1885. In 1908 it changed its name to Social Democratic

Party, a distinction without the least scrap of difference. In 1911 it was joined by a few Clarion Scouts and I.L. Pers., and changed its name again to British Socialist Party.

Each of these political parties (if they can be writ as different parties) was practically dominated by the same personalities—Hyndman, Quelch, Lee, Hunter-Watts, Belfort Bax, Dan Irving, Tom Kennedy, Jack Jones, and Will Thorne. Each party practised the 'tactic' inherited from the Chartists."

The S.D.F., after seeking in vain for an alliance with the Liberals, went to the Tories, and fought the 1885 Election on their money, with the avowed object of splitting the Liberal vote. This very nearly brought the party to an unhonoured end, the only good that could have come to the workers out of the transaction.

This policy of political bargaining went on, with varying success in the shape of Parliamentary honours for the auctioneers of working-class votes, until in 1903 the Scottish, and in 1904 the London, branches left in disgust to form the S.L.P. and S.P.G.B. respectively. Old readers of this journal will remember that our pages between 1904 and 1914 contained ample evidence of the persistence of the S.D.F.'s peculiar conception of working-class antagonism to capitalist political organisations. It changed its name to S.D.P. without discarding its errors, and in 1910 another attempt was made to form a "bloc" with the Liberals, who, however, like the Labour Party now, were indifferent if not actively hostile.

In 1901 the S.D.F. withdrew from the Labour Party (then the Labour Representation Committee), and for twelve years remained outside, supporting first one and then the other of the capitalist parties. It incidentally carried on a guerilla warfare with the I.L.P. rather in the nature of a squabble for the spoils attaching to the disposal of the corpse of working-class independence.

The S.D.F. stuck tight to the alliance idea, and in 1913 had decided to re-affiliate with the Labour Party, when the war came. The inevitable then took place, and the B.S.P. went all out for the murder of the workers at their masters' behest.

In due time another split took place: Hyndman and the jingo group called themselves the National Socialist Party, while the others, still the B.S.P., first worked the I.L.P., and later affiliated again with the Labour Party. Both sections kept their belief in the use of helping one enemy to

fight another. The N.S.P., reverting to its old name, S.D.F., is now again urging that the Labour Party should link up with any party which will endeavour to oust the Coalition.

The B.S.P. eventually formed the bulk of the membership of the Communist Party, and that body—having re-discovered the "tactic"—proclaims amid great flourish of trumpets that if only they can help the Labour Party, to help the Liberals, to turn out Lloyd George, the Russian Revolution will be saved and all will be well. They are urged by the Bolsheviks to this course as the last word in political strategy, but, as Clarke points out, many exiles from Russia towards the end of last century were studying the English political world, and at a later date many of those now prominent in the Bolshevik Party, including Litvino Rothstein, Tchicherine, and Petrov, were members of the S.D.F. or B.S.P. This, then, was where they picked up the idea, which "was conveyed to Russia, where the masses are not more, but less, advanced than they are here (*vide* Lenin), and where it is alleged to have been successful in the hands of a party of 'iron discipline,' which is due, to quote Lenin again, 'to a great many historic peculiarities of Russia.' In the process of time it arrives back to the land of its birth, where it succeeded in sowing only distrust and dissension and is dished out to British revolutionaries as 'Lenin's revolutionary strategy' and 'the adroit tactic of the Bolsheviks' in the pious hope that the reiteration of such alluring phrases will convince the unsuspecting that they are marrying a comely damsel of tender years, whereas in truth they are being saddled with a withered-up, pre-historic hag."

The foregoing brief history of the "tactic" is commended to the notice of those who think that the Socialist Revolution can be achieved by some energetic political wire-pulling, and by cunning manœuvring of the votes of the "masses." In a game of that kind the ruling class and their hirelings know all there is to be known. They have been at it for centuries, and if the outcome of it is to be somebody's funeral, it won't be theirs. The result of this fooling will be what it has always been, suffering and disillusionment for the unfortunate workers who are taken in by it.

The antecedents as well as the present

activities of the "intelligent minority," who, as the Communist Party, are to shepherd the mere untutored workers, are sufficient to justify describing them as in the main blind leaders of the blind. Under the guise of revolutionary discipline, that party shows just the same slavish hero-worship and ignorant chatter of revolution as typified the S.D.F. at its worst. A recent incident will serve to illustrate this internal rottenness of the "Burlesque Bolsheviks." At a meeting of the London District Council (October 8th) the delegates were asked to rise to their feet as a token of respect when "Lord" McManus entered the room, and with hardly an exception the request was immediately complied with!

Could "Jimmy" Thomas expect or receive more?

Whether these people are good or bad leaders is, however, not the important point. The particular course they are advising has in the past proved disastrous, not only here, but in Germany, France, and everywhere else where working-class organisations have left the safe path of independence for the morass of alliances.

Socialism will be achieved by Socialists; by the deliberate action, that is, of those who, understanding what is at the root of the present evils, know what is necessary for their removal.

The existence of a considerable proportion of convinced Socialists precludes the possibility of swaying the electorate by emotional appeals. Without ignorant emotionalism there is no need, no possibility, of political leadership, whether from a traditional ruling class or from a minority of superior intellects.

Political bargaining exists because Socialist knowledge is lacking. Without such knowledge neither the Communist Party nor anyone else can give you Socialism. Do not, therefore, waste time trying to drag the working class into striving for an object which they do not understand;

HELP US TO PROPAGATE
SOCIALISM. H.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1, when regular delivery will be arranged.

THE KEY TO HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT.

"According to the materialistic conception, the decisive element of history is pre-eminently the production and reproduction of life and its material requirements. This implies, on the one hand, the production of the means of existence (food, clothing, shelter, and the necessary tools); on the other hand, the generation of children, the propagation of the species. The social institutions, under which the people of a certain historical period and of a certain country are living, are dependent on these two forms of production; partly on the development of labour, partly on that of the family. The less labour is developed, and the less abundant the quantity of its production and, therefore, the wealth of society, the more society is seen to be under the domination of sexual ties. However, under this formation based on sexual ties, the productivity of labour is developed more and more. At the same time, private property and exchange, distinctions of wealth, exploitation of the labour power of the others and, by this agency, the foundation of class antagonism, are formed. These new elements of society strive in the course of time to adapt the old state of society to the new conditions, until the impossibility of harmonising these two at last leads to a complete revolution. The old forms of society founded on sexual relations are abolished in the clash with the recently developed social classes. A new society steps into being, crystallised into the State. The units of the latter are no longer sexual, but local groups, a society in which family relations are entirely subordinated to property relations, thereby freely developing those class antagonisms and class struggles that make up the contents of all written history up to the present time."

FREDERICK ENGELS.

Parliament, the executive power of the ruling class, levy rates and taxes upon the owners of this property, in order to defray the cost of the legislative machinery, represented by the various departments of the State, i.e., Home Office, Foreign Office, War Office, Board of Education, etc., etc. The position of the worker is that he receives wages—when fortune favours him with work—which are based upon the cost of living.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 3s. 0d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY



MAR. 4, 1922

AN IMPARTIAL CRITIC.

A story is related of Mark Twain that he once offered to deliver a lecture to the members of a great scientific society upon their own special subject. The secretary of the society suavely pointed out that Mr. Twain's equipment for such a lecture consisted of an entire absence of any knowledge of the subject chosen. "All the better," replied Twain. "I shall be quite impartial in my treatment of the matter." Somehow this failed to satisfy the secretary and the lecture was never delivered.

Undeterred by this example, we still find people willing to deal with subjects, or criticise them, whose only qualification for the purpose is a complete lack of acquaintance with the subject they attempt to discuss.

An instance of this kind occurs in the February issue of the "English Review," where a writer calling himself "Judex" contributes an article entitled "The Lesson of Bolshevism."

"Judex" scorns to burden his article with any facts, evidence, or quotations to support the various statements he makes. This may be a sign of wisdom, for had he attempted to quote any authority for many of his remarks he could at once have been exposed for an imposter, whereas now one may conclude that he is merely ignorant.

He claims that Marxian Socialism has been tried in Russia and been found a failure when he says:

"The orthodox expropriation of the expropriators (according to Marx) has been completely tried."

The most superficial reader of Marx's writings knows that the above statement is not only false, but is in complete contradiction to the whole of Marx's teachings. From the world-renowned "Communist Manifesto" down to the "Civil War in France," Marx showed how human societies have developed from primitive communism to Capitalism, and how Capitalism, when it has passed through the stages of its development, must be followed by Socialism. In the preface to the "Critique of Political Economy" (page 12, Kerr ed.), Marx says:

"No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions for their existence have matured in the womb of the old society."

Later on, in the preface to "Capital," Marx extends and amplifies this point in the famous, oft-quoted passage where he says:

"One nation can and should learn from others. And even when a society has got upon the right track for the discovery of the natural laws of its movement—and it is the ultimate aim of this work to lay bare the economic law of motion of modern society—it can neither clear by bold leaps, nor remove by legal enactments, the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development. But it can shorten and lessen the birth pangs."

(Page XIX, Sonnenschein Ed.)

These quotations prove not only that Marx did not expect a country in a backward condition economically to be able to establish Socialism, but also that he expressly denied such a thing being possible. So far from following Marx, as "Judex" suggests, Lenin has acted in direct opposition to Marx's teaching. To suggest that a country like Russia, still largely feudalistic, with only the beginnings of Capitalism, is "most suitable for applied Socialism," shows a most complete ignorance of Marx, coupled with a boundless recklessness of assertion.

After such a brilliant display of his marvellous intellect, one is not surprised to find such a gem as the following in "Judex's" article:

"In highly industrialised countries such as

MASS PRODUCTION.**How it affects the Workers.**

It is hardly possible nowadays to pick up a newspaper or magazine that does not contain articles on bad trade, excessive taxation, and unemployment. In some of these articles the writers try to show that bad trade is largely caused by high taxes; while others insist that high wages and low output is the chief cause. Some writers combine the two, and represent the capitalist as a helpless victim being squeezed dry between the Government and the workers.

Those who understand Socialism, know that periods of bad trade are the result of modern methods of production, that outstrip the demand for commodities all over the capitalist world, and that bad trade will recur periodically, or will continue as a chronic social complaint so long as trade governs the production of wealth. Once we understand this clearly it is easy to see the futility of all the reforms suggested by writers who do not appear to understand the nature of the problem. In certain cases the fact that they argue that taxes should be lightened for the capitalist; that he is justified in reducing wages, in demanding greater efficiency and longer hours, arouses at once the suspicion that such writers are either capitalists themselves or are in the pay of capitalists.

One writer in the "Sunday Pictorial" (22/1/22), Mr. J. Ellis Barker, puts the case from the capitalist standpoint and tries to prove that the workers' interests are identical with capitalist interests. That the capitalist cannot extend his business and employ more workers because the Government takes in taxation the necessary capital. This is one of the stock arguments of the anti-wasters, but everybody should know that there is no shortage of capital wherever there is a promise of dividends. The shortage is in the effective demand for commodities, and if the capitalists were relieved of the whole burden of taxation employment would not increase unless the effective demand were increased.

Moreover, the money taken in taxes by the Government is either spent in wages—to Civil servants, etc.—or in purchase of goods, the manufacturers of which employ workers. These workers spend their wages on commodities placed on the market by other manufacturers. Thus, not only is the

England, Germany, Belgium, and even France, Socialism could only function with enormously reduced populations. In Britain certainly 10,000,000 people would have to die or emigrate; in Belgium 2,000,000; in France 5,000,000; because Socialism would imply the elimination of all production of a luxury or surplus character, thereby implying the elimination of an export trade which is the strength of highly industrial people."

Not a tittle of evidence nor a single fact is given to support this bundle of nonsense.

As Socialism will mean the abolition of the idle class of present society—the Capitalist class—who gather all the best of what is produced to themselves to lead lives of barbaric luxury, the first result of the establishment of Socialism will be that a large quantity of wealth will become available for distribution among the producers that was never within their reach under Capitalism. So far from it being necessary to reduce the populations under Socialism, the elimination of the idle thieves will be one factor in making it possible to support far larger numbers than the present system is doing.

"Judex's" complete innocence of the simplest economic facts is shown in the scintillating assertion that "the purest Socialist State must function on capital or credit of some kind." Evidently he has not the faintest conception of what capital is, or upon what credit is based.

Capital is wealth used for the purpose of producing a profit. Profit is a portion of that wealth produced by the worker, but robbed from him under the present system. Hence capital is wealth used for the purpose of robbery. Clearly, when the system of robbery is abolished, capital will disappear. Production will then be carried on for use; wealth will be used to promote the well-being of all.

Will sympathisers of the Party in**GLASGOW**

desirous of forming a Branch in that district communicate with

H. J. WATSON,

5, Elliot St., Glasgow.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.

Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

demand for goods increased, but the number of unemployed is diminished by Government expenditure. From the workers' standpoint, therefore, Government expenditure, coming on top of ordinary capitalist outlay, is all to the good. This is easily seen, without going into the purpose and object of government, when we remember how unemployment figures fell during the war and wages rose in many industries. During the war Government expenditure reached the highest level ever known.

Mr. Barker argues that the lack of capital forces capitalists to act along certain lines: in bad times, and faced with the competition of countries less heavily taxed, they must either sell at a loss or close their factories. In good times they raise prices and thus pass the burden on to the masses. He says:—

"In good times income tax and super-tax are paid by the masses as a whole in increased prices, while in bad times unbearably high taxes lead to general unemployment and distress. The poorest pay income tax and super-tax, estate duty and succession duty in their bread and their boots, in their coal and their rent, and sometimes in unemployment and distress. It is chiefly in their interest that taxation should be as low as possible."

Here, the exponent of capitalist economics, in his eagerness to clear the capitalist of blame for bad times, unconsciously exposes the rottenness of the system he is trying to defend. What do the workers get out of the system? In bad times they suffer from unemployment and distress and in good times they suffer from increased prices.

A Socialist knows that the workers suffer acute distress in periods of bad trade and are forced to study the strictest economy in the best of times in order to live on their wages, but he has yet to learn that while in this condition they can pay any of the taxes enumerated by Mr. Barker. Whilst wages are based on the cost of living they rise or fall generally, over a given period, as the prices of necessities rise or fall, and the worker never gets much more out of industry, even when he is lucky enough to be always at work, than the necessities of life required to keep him fit and to support his family.

The cost of living is the mean level around which the industrial war takes place. Supply and demand plays its part, but nearly always on the side of the masters, because

there are nearly always more workers than jobs. Represented by leaders who do not understand the economic laws of the capitalist system nor how to direct the workers in times of crisis, the latter are always at a disadvantage in disputes over wages.

Mr. Barker's unsolicited and unconscious admission that the workers suffer whether trade is good or bad is true in substance, though based on a fallacy. Let us examine his proposed remedy and see how much that is worth.

There follows half a column of statistics on the comparative values of English and American production, a few cheap sneers about workers who restrict output, and a piously-expressed opinion that no one wants to see the old evils of sweating restored, and then he openly advocates mass production as a remedy for bad trade and unemployment. He says:—

"It is clear that we can treble British production, and with British production our national wealth and national income, by improving our industrial methods."

Now, mass production means not only the adoption of labour-saving machinery and devices, but production in such vast quantities that waste is eliminated. In mass production capitalists reduce their wages bill for the production of a given quantity of wealth to the lowest level yet reached. Factories worked on this principle in America turn out commodities in such vast quantities that they are forced to close down for weeks at a stretch, or discharge thousands of workers, until the surplus is sold. The very company cited by Mr. Barker as a shining example of mass production prosperity has given him the lie. In 1920 the Ford Company employed 52,000 persons to make 100,000 cars a month. In 1921 they employed 32,000 persons to make 87,000 cars per month, and had to close down owing to over-production. What became of the 20,000 workers not wanted—and what happens as mass production becomes more general? The answer is obvious, yet Mr. Barker further outrages common-sense by stating in black type that

"There is no fear of over-production," and following this in italics:

"There is an unlimited demand throughout the world for cheap goods."

Ford cars are cheap. Why did the Ford factory close down and reduce the number

of its employees if the demand is unlimited?

When Mr. Barker writes about unlimited demand, he is writing unlimited nonsense, because there is no such thing. Production and demand, or production and consumption, may be likened to a tank with water continually running in from a tap and out through a waste pipe. If two gallons flow in every minute and during the same time only one gallon can pass the waste, the flow will have to be stopped periodically or the tank will overflow. In filling the social tank with commodities, however, human labour functions. Human labour-power is the worker's only commodity; he lives by the sale of it and starves if he cannot sell it. Unable to take out of the tank more than the value of their wages, or go on producing when demands fall off, and a constantly diminishing number of workers are required. Mr. Barker gives figures that credits the American worker with producing as much as three British workers. According to his reasoning, unemployment in America should be less severe than in this country. Is it? Everybody knows that the number of unemployed in the United States is treble the number of British unemployed.

To sum up, let every worker understand once for all the real meaning and significance of labour-power as a commodity. Let him realise that his wages can seldom rise above what it costs to maintain himself and his family. That wages are more likely to fall below that level as competition increases; he, therefore, only deludes himself when he imagines that high or low taxes affect him in the long run. The inevitable consequences of mass production are increased unemployment and lower wages. Mass production is the latest and most callous form of capitalism; it manufactures cheap and shoddy goods to feed and clothe its overworked and poverty-stricken slaves. It drives the slaves to despair through long periods of unemployment and dread of the sack. Mass production is not a thing of the future; it is with us now in all its hideousness, and promise of worse to come. May it startle the workers of all lands out of their lethargy, strip the scales from their eyes, and force them to examine the claims of the Socialist; for only then will they understand that they are slaves, why they are slaves, and how they can be free. F. F.

CAPITAL'S STRANGLE-HOLD.

In an article published in the review of the International Federation of Trade Unions a flood of light is thrown upon the question of the capitalists holding up production. It appears that the International Labour Office, acting upon the instructions of its governing body, instituted an enquiry as a result of a meeting held at Genoa in June, 1920. At this meeting a representative of the employers' group said:

"The cost of living has increased in every country to an alarming extent; this phenomenon is due to many causes, but under-production is certainly one of these causes. Under-production is in its turn a result of several causes, some of which (scarcity of raw material, lack of shipping, disorganisation of land transport, etc.), are not within the scope of this body; but it would be interesting to consider whether and to what extent conditions of labour (such as the adoption of the 8-hour day, the frequency of strikes and lock-outs too, if you like, opposition to methods of remuneration proportionate to individual or collective production, etc.) have influenced production."

After some discussion on this point, it was finally agreed to, that the enquiry should be of a general character and not exclusively confined to the conditions of labour.

The enquiry was entrusted to Professor Milhaud, of the University of Geneva, and the first volume of the "Enquiry on Production—General Report" is now to hand, and forms the basis of the article, "An Enquiry into the Causes of the Decrease in Production," from which we quote.

There are two lengthy quotations from well-known capitalist representatives, such as M. Millerand and Mr. Herbert Hoover, the American organiser, both of whom during 1919 and 1920 delivered speeches in which they called upon the workers for increased efforts towards greater production. Of course, neither of these gentlemen called upon the capitalist class to produce more, they apparently being well aware of the fact that it was useless, since the capitalists not only do not work, but have no intention of so doing.

Then follows several lengthy extracts from the report, showing the fluctuation of prices during December, 1919, and June, 1921, concerning such "products of primary importance" as silk, cotton, cast iron, wool, etc., which, reaching their highest price point in May, 1920, fell considerably between that date and June, 1921.

We insert this point because what follows shows that the writer of the article in question must have favoured the demand for increased production, for in commenting upon the great fall in prices, he (or she) asks as follows:

"Was not this fall in prices just the very remedy of which the whole world was in need? Was not the general high level of prices the scourge under which the world had been groaning? Was not the return to normal prices the factor from which increased production was to be expected?"

How the workers were to benefit by the great fall in prices, he does not show; in fact, although the attempt might have been made, it must have proved a failure.

When the markets of the world are glutted with the wealth produced by the working class, and a fall in prices takes place, it follows that the labour market is subject to the operation of the same factors as operate in the other markets, for besides producing a larger army of unemployed and thus increasing the competition for jobs, a decline in the cost of living cheapens the cost of producing the commodity labour-power, and consequently its price (wages) tends to fall.

The main point of the article to which we draw attention is, that with the fall in prices the writer seems very disagreeably surprised to find that something else had happened, and with an air of injured innocence he laments:

"The fall in prices gave rise to a crisis in production such as the world had not yet witnessed."

Strange! For it was then discovered that this crisis brought forth a universal restriction of production, a huge systematic plan all over the world to hold up the production of wealth and thus maintain high prices. This was not the policy of the wicked workers in the Trade Unions, who, we are very often told, are guilty of slowing down and "Ca' Canny." On the contrary, it was the capitalists who, when faced with falling markets, decided upon restricting output.

Under the heading of systematic restriction the article gives several examples taken from Professor Milhaud's report, as follows:

"In the first place there is the restriction of the production of Rubber, in which movement the Rubber Growers Association took the initiative, in its circular issued on September 24th 1920, the result of which was a reduction in production amounting to 30 per cent.

"The situation with regard to cotton has been exactly the same. In December, 1920, the production of Japan was already reduced by 40 per cent., and further reductions were contemplated. In Egypt it was the public authorities themselves who took the initiative. The provincial councils unanimously decided to restrict the cultivation of cotton for 1921. In accordance with this decision the Sultan signed a decree on December 7th ordering that the area under cotton should be reduced by two-thirds and prohibiting the cultivation of cotton in upper Egypt except in the parts irrigated by the Nile."

"The American Cotton Growers Association succeeded in bringing about the largest percentage of reduction on record in the production of cotton. This Association boasted of the firm and vigorous attitude of the bankers of the whole of the cotton-growing districts, who refused to grant the necessary advances and credits to enable the cultivation of enough cotton to ensure a normal crop."

The "Cotton News" of June 1st, 1921, refers, furthermore, to the radical restriction of the use of artificial manures in the old cotton-growing States along the east bank of the Mississippi,

"which means to say that the growth and ripening of the new crop will be impeded and, furthermore, that the crop, already greatly restricted as regards the area under cultivation, will be seriously handicapped during the growing season. That applies even in those cases where the climatic conditions would be otherwise favourable."

"A similar policy has been applied by the International Federation of Linen Manufacturers, comprising the linen manufacturers of France, England, Holland, Belgium, Ireland, and Denmark, who declared at their meeting held at Brussels on November 18th, 1920, that the most important consideration was to restrict production and stabilise the market."

Many more examples of this kind are given, showing to what an extent the capitalists have their grip on the world's resources. Figures are also given concerning the amount of unemployment in various countries.

R. REYNOLDS.

£1,000 FUND.

Already acknowledged	£725 17 9½
Donations:—	
E. Boden, S. Africa	50 0 0
"W.H."	1 0 0
"B.B."	0 12 6
Will Dixon	0 7 0
A. Lyle	0 2 0
Mrs. Cohen	2 0 0
Stamp Books:—	
Walthamstow Br., 84	0 12 0
E. London Br., 77	1 0 0
Islington Br.	1 0 0
Delegate Meeting Collection	0 8 6

TOTAL .. £782 19 9½

OLD ANARCHY WRIT NEW.

"Socialism and Personal Liberty." By Robert Dell (Leonard Parsons, 4s. 6d. net.)

In what was perhaps the finest novel of the 19th century, George Meredith wrote an aphorism, "Our new thoughts have thrilled dead bosoms." This aphorism at once springs to the mind on reading Mr. Dell's book. The old Anarchist fallacies that were pulverised years ago are trotted out as new and profound truths. Moreover, to the anger, no doubt, of Anarchists, he hails the Guild Socialists as the discoverers of ideas that are nearly a century old in the Anarchist armoury. Thus he gives the Guild Socialists credit for the statement that "a human being as an individual is fundamentally incapable of being represented" (p. 39). As a matter of fact, this fallacy is as old as Sterner, though the latter certainly followed the idea to a logical conclusion, which the Guild Socialists do not. Mr. G. D. H. Cole is quoted as saying that:—

"He can be represented only in relation to some particular purpose or group of purposes" (*ibid*). As this is the only possible meaning to representation, Mr. Cole gives away his whole case, though Mr. Dell fails to see this glaring fact.

The objections he raises against the "State" are simply those of Bakunian, and have formed part of the Anarchist propaganda for over half a century. Mr. Dell, however, admits one or two facts that Anarchists deny. Thus he says:—

"In any form of society there will have to be regulations in collective production" (p. 32). and on page 33:—

"Socialism—the socialisation or collective ownership of the means of production—is now the only alternative to private monopoly."

After placing himself in a dilemma by his contradictory attitudes, Mr. Dell flounders further in his attempts to reconcile the oppositions of his case. A few years ago he supported the Syndicalists, who, in their crude ignorance, claimed that the various means of production should belong to those operating them, as: "The Mines to the Miners," "The Railways to the Railwaymen," etc. One enthusiast suggested that they should carry their list to a logical conclusion by adding such items as "The Sewers to the Scavengers," "The Prisons to the Convicts," "The Asylums to the Insane," etc; but his suggestions were not received with any enthusiasm.

Mr. Dell now realises that there are many difficulties in the Syndicalist case, and he finds partial salvation in Guild "Socialism." But his dread of democracy is so great that he wishes to combine certain features of both Syndicalism and Guild "Socialism." While Mr. Cole would have collective ownership of the means of production, with management and operation of the various industries by the different Guilds, Mr. Dell prefers that—except for certain collective services as railways, banks, posts, mines, etc.—the workers in the various industries should have absolute ownership of their particular branch. The idiocy of this proposal should be apparent to a child. Food is of immensely greater importance to the members of society than railways. Yet the production and distribution of food is left in the "absolute ownership" of a particular group, while the railways are to be collectively owned! And this although he had previously admitted that "collective ownership of the means of production is now the only alternative to private monopoly."

The fear of democracy carries Mr. Dell into other contradictions. A long chapter is devoted to "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat," where he opposes both Marxian Socialism and the system established in Russia by the Bolsheviks. What does Mr. Dell offer as an alternative? This:—

"But democracy is impossible except in small areas where the elector can always be in close touch with his representatives, and no real control of representatives is possible without the right of recall, which can be efficiently exercised only in small areas. Democracy, therefore, involves decentralisation. Direct election should be restricted to small areas—the commune or ward—and the representatives so elected should send delegates to the provincial or national bodies" (p. 39. *Italics ours*).

To the questions that at once spring forward, "Why is democracy only possible in small areas?" "Why cannot the right of recall be exercised in large areas?" no answers are given—and for the best of reasons. There are none that would bear a moment's examination. But the cream of the joke is that this scheme of Mr. Dell's is what operates in Russia, and which he condemns there.

We have criticised this anti-Socialist system before, and have shown that it is ruled by oligarchy, and is deliberately designed to prevent the members of society having control over the national executives.

With all its faults, the Parliamentary system in England and France, that Mr. Dell condemns, does give this power to the electors if they care to exercise it.

Other contradictions and fallacies abound in this book, but we have no room to deal with them all. One other example, however, is worth noting. On page 64 he says that "an extraordinary ignorance of Marxism is general in England," and quotes a writer in the "Times" as an example. He then says (p. 65): "Everybody has not time to read 'Das Kapital,' which is not easy reading," and he suggests that the "Times" writer might, at least, have read the "Civil War in France." We know from experience that it is the common practice for journalists and others to criticise and condemn Marx before they have read his works, but this reads suspiciously like an apology for Mr. Dell himself, for in the section on pages 144-150 he not only confuses price and value, but displays a complete ignorance of Marx's discovery of the base of value in social labour-time, when he (Mr. Dell) is dealing with two articles produced by two individuals. His other absurdities of money, wages, competition, employment of one person by another for private gain, etc., all being necessary under Socialism, shows how a lack of knowledge of Marxism may cause a writer to flounder among endless contradictions. Still, his taste in drama is exquisite. He believes Charlie Chaplin is a great artist. J. F.

OUR COURAGEOUS MASTERS.

The Press is an organ of capitalist propaganda and attempts to mould working-class ideas to suit the interests of the capitalist class. Yet this Press often contains the antidote to this propaganda. If members of the working class were to read the reports of company meetings, for instance, the work of the Socialist would be rendered easier; for in these reports we often get the real point of view of the capitalist.

"Labour leaders," stump orators of the "Economic Study Club," and other anti-Socialist organisations, all are assuring the worker of the identity of his interests with those of his employer; they exhort the worker to pull together with his employer in a spirit of brotherly co-operation for the solution of the difficulties which adversely affect them both, depriving the employer of

the "fair" return on his capital and the worker of his wages.

The reading by workers of such reports as that of the London County Westminster and Parr's Bank, published in "Sunday Times" (5/2/22), would do much to counteract this sort of twaddle.

The Chairman (Mr. Leaf), in his opening remarks, said: "And we have won some peace, for the moment at least, in those labour disputes which, to the mind of the social philosopher twelve months ago, presented the gloomiest point of a gloomy horizon." This "peace" upon which Mr. Leaf is congratulating himself and his colleagues, has been brought about, as many workers know from personal experience, by the wholesale defeats of the working class in industry after industry. Moulders, miners, and ship-joiners have been forced, after months of struggle, to submit to sweeping wage reductions. Others, foreseeing defeat, have submitted to reductions in wages and extension of hours without a struggle.

Then Mr. Leaf goes on to remark upon the miners' lock-out. "The outstanding event of the year in our internal economy has been the great coal stoppage. That happily (italic mine) ended, not in a complete victory for either side, but in an agreement to set on foot a system of profit-sharing which constitutes, I suppose, the greatest experiment in partnership between capital and labour that the world has yet seen." Representatives of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain and representatives of the Mining Association recently met and after discussion issued an official statement ("Daily Herald," 9/2/22), in which we read: "It was found that the wages of the workmen are unprecedentedly low in many districts, more particularly in the exporting areas. In seven out of the thirteen areas scheduled in the agreement, wages have been brought down to the minimum. . . . The "Daily Herald" quotes the Executive of the Miners' Federation to the effect that "the men have suffered drastic reductions in wages, that have brought them far below the pre-war standard of living. . . ." When Mr. Leaf speaks of the happy ending of the conflict he is evidently not looking at it from the point of view of the miner.

We have seen how the workers have fared. How have the masters weathered

the storm of the past year? Mr. Leaf remarked at the opening of his speech, and repeated later on, that "the past year had been one of courage in facing losses."

"Finally agriculture, our most important industry, though it has had a very bad year, seems also to have touched bottom. The farmers have borne their losses very well out of accumulated profits in the past; and, with large reductions of wages, are probably able to make both ends meet."

Brave fellows! The losses that they have so courageously borne have only been relative losses after all. The losses of last year are offset against the profits of previous years, part of which had been reserved against the contingency of loss, the balance being very much on the profit side, for the losses have "been borne very well." The bank, whose shareholders Mr. Leaf is addressing, has put aside half a million pounds against future contingencies. Certainly not a bad foundation for future courage. The miners do not seem to have done quite so well out of their share of the profits under the system mentioned by Mr. Leaf. Thriftless chaps, no doubt!

In this speech of Mr. Leaf's we have the real point of view of the capitalist. The end of a conflict which plunged the miners into deeper poverty is described as happy. "Large reductions in wages" enable the capitalist to "make ends meet" and are therefore a subject for congratulation. The workers' loss is the capitalists' gain.

In the last quotation Mr. Leaf also shows how little the capitalist believes in the economic fallacies propagated by his agents and apologists. The workers have been told that if they accept reductions in wages the capitalist will be able to lower the price of his commodities, thus enabling him to compete more successfully with his foreign rivals and so lead to increased employment. This view is widely accepted among the working class, and has been, I believe, to some extent responsible for the tame manner in which wage reductions have been accepted. Mr. Leaf certainly only speaks of farmers, but what he says of them is true of practically the whole capitalist class, for hardly a section of the working class have not suffered reductions of wages during the past year.

The truth of the matter is that the market conditions had already compelled the

capitalists to either reduce prices or curtail production. They then take advantage of the excessive supply of labour-power to beat down wages and thus recoup their losses.

The workers, by applying their energy to nature-given material, produce the wealth of the world. But as the means of production are the private property of capitalists, the products are also theirs. The workers receive in return for their labour-power, on the average, but sufficient to maintain themselves in the state of efficiency required and to reproduce the next generation of wage-labourers. The surplus, and with the continued application of science to industry this is constantly growing, is divided among the master class in the shape of rent, interest, and profit. Increases in wages, other things remaining the same, mean decreases in the surplus appropriated by the capitalist, and, *vice versa*, decreases in wages mean increases in the surplus appropriated by the capitalists.

The remarks quoted from Mr. Leaf's speech bear out this contention. Therefore, when Mr. Leaf praises a co-partnership or "profit-sharing" scheme, we can form an idea whom the scheme will benefit. And, as a matter of fact, all profit-sharing and co-partnership schemes, are but devices for extracting more surplus value from the workers. The invitations of the capitalists and their agents to the workers to recognise an identity of interests and to co-operate with their employers are invitations to the workers to permit themselves quietly, and therefore more effectively, to be fleeced.

Not by a false friendship and co-operation with the capitalists will the workers emancipate themselves from the necessity of toiling for long hours in order to secure a miserable existence, but by recognising the fundamental antagonism between their masters' interests and their own and organising politically to overthrow the master class by capturing the weapon by means of which the master class enslave the workers, viz., political power. Then will the way be clear to inaugurate, not a co-operation wherein one of the participants can live in luxury on the proceeds, while the other is forced to eke out his share of the "profits" with doles from the Guardians, but a co-operative commonwealth in which the principle of production and distribution shall be "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs."

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 8 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spiceal-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.8. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Sec., 142 Bulwer-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER AND DISTRICT.—Communications to Sec., 11 Davis-st., Longsight, M/C. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Sundays, at 3 p.m.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Monday at 7, at 107, Charlotte Street, W.1. Communications to Sec., 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. Discussion after branch business.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 3, Lyveden-rd., Tooting, S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays, at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 19, Beechfield-rd., Finsbury Pk., N.4. Branch meets Saturdays 8.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Edmonton, Silver Street, 11.30 a.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Stratford, Vicarage-lane, 7.30 p.m.
Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 a.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m.
Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.
Wimbledon Broadway, 8 p.m.

Fridays:

Tottenham, Junction Clyde-road and Phillip-lane, 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.
Tooting, Undine-street, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.; and
Printed by R. E. TAYLOR & SON, LTD., 55/57, Banner Street, London, E.C.1.

**THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.****OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No 212. Vol. 18.]

LONDON, APRIL, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

A RAY OF HOPE— FOR THE CAPITALIST.

"WAGES, PRICES AND PROFITS."

The Labour Publishing Company, Ltd.,
6, Tavistock Square, W.C.1.
Price 6s.

At a moment when the capitalist Press and apologists are shrieking to the workers that "business is being ruined" by the huge wages paid to the employees, when drastic wage cuts and longer hours are being enforced in every industry, it will be comforting and refreshing, as well as reassuring, for those workers to turn to the pages of this slim volume.

In its 110 pages the workers who are greatly worried by "the serious difficulties" of the employers, and who wonder how the masters can stand the strain of "high wages" and "bad trade," will find balm and solace for their harassed feelings. A wave of relief will surge through their minds when they find that, after all, there are a few gleams of hope—for the masters—and even a fragment or two of resources left to them to tide over the present "time of terrible strain."

The book consists largely of tables and figures dealing with wages, prices, profits, capitalisations, etc. These tables are compiled almost entirely from "official" sources—that is, sources provided by the masters themselves in various Government Departments. It is well known, however, that Government officials are terribly busy men, and thus some of the information they supply is sometimes deficient in certain details. The compilers of this book

have endeavoured to make good such deficiencies from other sources.

The essential reason for the existence and continuance of capitalism is Profit—of course, "Fair" Profit—so we will take one or two points from that section first.

The vast majority of business undertakings to-day are in the form of joint stock companies. When these are public companies, they must issue a balance-sheet each year. A useful account and analysis of these balance-sheets, and how they are "arranged" to conceal the truth, is given on pages 31-36 of this work. On these sheets the nominal profits made during the year are shown. These profits are usually tabulated as a percentage of the capital of the company, and here one of the gleams of hope shines through the somewhat mystifying figures of the balance-sheets.

The ordinary uninstructed person would imagine that the "capital" shown on the balance-sheet was the amount of *actual cash* invested by the shareholders. Fortunately for the shareholders, this need not be so, and in many cases is far from being so. Sometimes the shareholders are given shares, called "bonus" shares, for which they pay nothing, but on which they are entitled to draw dividends. Thus a company with £200,000 capital might distribute "bonus" shares in the ratio of one new share for every two original shares. This would increase the "paid-up" capital—so called—to £300,000, and the profits would now be reckoned against this new

figure, although the shareholders had only provided two-thirds of that amount.

If the profits made in a year were £20,000, this would be entered as 10 per cent. on the original capital, but the same amount of profit would only represent 6.6 per cent. on the new "watered" capital.

On page 92 the following table is given of the Bonus shares issued in 1920, as far as these are obtainable:—

BONUS SHARES ISSUED IN 1920.

Industry	No. of Companies	Paid up Capital on which bonus is paid	Amount of bonus issue
		£	£
Amusement ..	6	990,558	530,588
Coal, Iron, Steel ..	21	9,965,055	6,141,171
Engineering and Ship-building ..	26	8,156,570	4,562,874
Finance and Banking ..	11	6,322,887	3,395,310
Food, Drink and Tobacco ..	22	19,827,466	7,779,094
Merchandising ..	11	4,631,202	530,588
Metals ..	10	3,557,279	873,749
Miscellaneous ..	24	9,135,629	6,987,344
Shipping, Railways and other Transport ..	20	13,055,786	5,510,406
Tea, Rubber, etc. ..	50	8,951,510	10,898,434
Textiles, Clothing and General Distribution ..	27	12,169,322	16,716,470
Warehousing, Storage, etc. ..	7	1,193,750	636,250
TOTALS ..	235	£97,957,114	£65,240,398

The totals show that bonus shares were distributed over all the industries mentioned, in the ratio of two new shares for every three original ones held; but in certain cases—as Tea and Textiles—the bonus shares distributed exceeded the original capital—in the latter case by over £4,000,000. In some cases bonus shares are paid for, but always at a price below the market rate prevailing at the time. Some instances are given on page 94:—

"The Imperial Tobacco Co., for instance, issued in 1920 new £1 shares to its ordinary shareholders in the proportion of one new share for every three held, at the price of 40s.; immediately after this operation the shares were quoted at 55s. 6d., thus enabling the shareholder to sell out his holding and pocket 15s. 6d. per share on the transaction, and enabled the company to increase its reserve (generally entitled 'share premium account') by 20s. on each share issued."

Further on we are told:—

"The Aerated Bread Co., for instance, in February, 1920, issued £63,750 £1 shares to its shareholders at the price of £4. The premiums

derived from these shares were put to reserve. In the next month, however, the company capitalised these premiums, together with certain other reserves, and issued fully paid-up bonus shares to its ordinary shareholders in the proportion of one new share for every share held, the new shares ranking for dividend as from March 28th of that year."

"Thus the Shell Transport & Trading Co. issued 6,433,852 £1 shares at par to its ordinary shareholders. The price of the ordinary shares, immediately after this operation, was quoted at £6; at this price consequently by selling all these shares, the shareholders would have been able to make a profit of £38,603,112."

While on page 100 we read that the coal firm of William Cory and Son "distributed a bonus in April, 1919, of two new shares for every one held."

Not so bad. Quite a few contingencies could be met from these little emoluments. The worried workers who were so anxious about how the poor employers could exist in the present state of affairs may now breathe more freely. The resources of these employees would seem to at least compare with the funds of the Amalgamated Engineering Union.

Another table is given on page 101, wherein it is shown that the nominal capital of new companies registered in Great Britain (Black-and-Tans are not given in this list) in 1920 was £593,189,032. It is thus evident that those wonderful high wages did not extract every penny from the employers' pockets.

The "concentration of wealth" theory of Marx has been disputed at various times by more various people, but a table on page 101 supports this contention. The number of Joint Stock Banks has decreased from 43 in 1913 to 20 in 1920—or by more than half. This has been due to amalgamation. The Capital and Reserves, however, have stood the strain fairly well, as they have increased from £83,068,000 in 1913 to £128,154,000 in 1920. Another factor that seems to possess moderate stamina is that of Deposits, which have risen in the same period from £809,352,000 to £1,961,527,000, or 142 per cent.

This is only part of the story. Of the above 20 Banks there are five (the "Big Five") that hold £1,628,375,000 of the deposits, or, roughly, 83 per cent. of the total.

Numerous other tables are given that are of great interest to the workers, and certain features are shown more clearly by

means of charts at the end of the book. We have only room for two further quotations. Referring to war bonuses, we read:—

"Nor did the workers succeed by this means in keeping wages fully abreast of prices, but the advance always followed behind, and never went before, the rise in the cost of living" (page 14).

While with reference to wages and prices we are told:—

"There is, moreover, no necessary connection between wages and prices. It is significant that the drastic reduction of wages to which the miners were subject at the end of the coalowners' lock-out, was immediately followed by a rise of 3s. per ton in the price of domestic coal" (page 43).

A most comforting and valuable book. The only regret is that it has not been found possible to issue it at a price within the reach of every worker. Still, even at 6s., it is well worth buying—if one can spare the cash—for it shows that, even without Reparations, the capitalists of this country can still hold out a little longer against the "bad times."

J. F.

BALLOT-BOX OR BATON?

An "Unemployed Demonstration" is one of the most saddening spectacles that civilisation can provide. Most of the industrial towns have their daily *débâcle* in front of the Union, but the futility of their actions does not seem to strike the demonstrators; in fact, all that seems to strike them is the policeman's baton. The humanitarian must turn aside in pity at the sight of a few hundred, or maybe thousand, starving and physically weakened individuals parading their distress and wretchedness up and down the streets, to be eventually sent scampering down back streets and alleys at the word of command from a police inspector. If only it were an equal combat, one would not feel its injustice quite so much. But there you have it. The master class takes the best from amongst the working class, feeds them and clothes them, strengthens them physically, enslaves them mentally by exercise and military discipline, and uses them to protect its property against the turbulence of the dispossessed. Indeed, so imbued with Capitalist notions are these working-class protectors of their masters' property that the authorities do not even fear that they will shirk the task of clubbing their mates and fellow-townsmen into obe-

dience. This was exemplified a little while back, when Scotch soldiers were detailed to quell disturbances in Glasgow! As for the demonstrators, they play into Master's hands in just the right fashion. They don't know anything about the Capitalist wire-pullers but "Here's a policeman; let's heave a brick at him!" Thus we get the working class busy fighting each other and the Capitalist maintaining his hold on the wealth that he steals from them!

Yet the remedy is so simple, and the method more simple still. The cause of poverty is the ownership of the means and instruments of wealth production by the Capitalist Class. The remedy, therefore, is to dispossess that class of its ownership. It maintains its ownership by virtue of its political control. Its economic domination would cease the moment that the working class captured the political machinery that sends the police and the soldiers against them. Curiously enough, the working class never seem to discover that it is they who gratuitously give the Capitalist Class the power to enslave them every time they go to the ballot-box! It is obvious, then, that the method of recapturing political control is going back to the ballot-box and voting for Socialism! It doesn't hurt as much as a whack on the head from a baton, anyway!

S. H. S.

ALAS! THOSE PROPHETS.

"If the left wing analysis is sound, the clash between the capitalist powers in August, 1914, marked the opening phase of the world revolution. The events in Russia during 1917-1918 were characteristic of a revolutionary crisis. None of us can tell how soon the forward march of the revolution will be resumed; but for the present we are marking time, and the capitalist system is making awkward efforts to reconsolidate itself. *Russia, too, is no longer 'in the rapids of revolution.'* Despite the dictatorship of the proletariat, her policy is in a large measure dictated by the peasantry—a reactionary class constituting four-fifths of the population." (Italics ours.)—E. and C. PAUL "Communist Review," March, 1922 (page 390).

SOCIALISM AND HUMAN NATURE.

Among the many objections that have been levelled against Socialism, the one concerning human nature strikes the writer as providing not only a lop-sided view of human nature, but at the same time an indictment of capitalist society unconsciously made by our opponents.

We are informed that "human nature being what it is, Socialism is quite impossible," or, as it is sometimes put, "you will have to change human nature."

This remarkable point of view was formulated in another way only a few days ago by the Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill, who, in a speech delivered in Loughborough Town Hall, stated:—

"A great mistake the Socialists make is that they follow a lot of logical and symmetrical theory, and forget all about human nature."—*Sunday Express*, 12/3/22.

Far be it from us to suggest that Mr. Churchill follows any theory that could be called either symmetrical or logical, or, when commenting upon his famous "gamble" at Gallipoli with the lives of thousands of our fellow-workers, that he had forgotten about human nature.

However, we are not so much concerned here with Churchill as we are with those of the working class who seriously entertain the objection stated above. Before proceeding to deal with this objection, we will state what the Socialists have to say of existing society, and how their theory corresponds to reality.

We assert that present-day society is based upon the private ownership of the means of living by the capitalist class, with the consequent enslavement of the working class, by means of whose labour wealth is produced. It follows, then, that, as the capitalist class do not work, they must obtain their wealth from the workers; in other words, they steal it from the working class. Of course, the means employed are not the same as those of the common thief or burglar, which are quite illegal, but by virtue of their "legal" ownership of the means of life, which is secured to them by their being in control of the political machinery, including the armed forces of the nation. To illustrate this point.

Let us assume that a small body of workers decided to "take and hold" some of the machinery of production for their

own benefit, we should at once witness the operation of the power that is in the hands of the capitalist class. The police force, in all probability, would be the first to appear on the scene, and, if this was not sufficient, the Army and Navy would be brought to bear upon the takers and holders, to teach them that "Britons never will be slaves," and in every large industrial dispute this armed force is ready at hand to teach the workers the lesson taught the school-child, "You must not touch; it isn't yours."

The armed forces are controlled through Parliament, for, though they act in the immediate upon the instructions from the Government Departments, such as the War Office and the Admiralty, they are ultimately under the control of the majority in the House of Commons, as this majority is responsible for the conduct of the various Departments. But the capitalists have not voted themselves into Parliament. The workers outnumber them by millions at the ballot-box. The tragic irony is, that the workers have handed over to the ruling class the very power by which they are kept in subjection. What follows as a consequence of the working class being a subject class is that the workers must operate upon the various tools of production to obtain a living. But the wealth, when produced, does not belong to them, but to the capitalists, who hand back a fraction of this wealth in the form of wages to the workers, to enable the latter to renew their energy, and thus repeat the performance of producing wealth. In modern society, on account of man's triumph over the forces of Nature, there is produced all over the civilised world an abundance of wealth sufficient to ensure a comfortable existence for all. But, as every worker is painfully aware, poverty and insecurity of existence is the lot of his class. We have to record the fact that, in spite of the productive power of to-day, we witness the anomaly of starvation in the midst of plenty. The Socialist, after analysing society and viewing all this, proposes to the workers that they should organise into a political party for the purpose of obtaining political power in order to change society from Capitalist to Socialist; that is, alter the basis of society from one of private ownership into one of the common ownership of the means of life, to be democratically owned and controlled by the whole community.

This being the proposition of the Socialist, we ask, What is there about it that in any way conflicts with what we know of human nature? The objection of our opponents merely begs the following question: What is human nature? The answer, that, in the opinion of the present writer, covers the ground fairly well, is the one met somewhere in his reading as "the manifold activities of man in general." This definition should meet with the approval of our opponents, for when they use the phrase "Human Nature," they generally refer to the actions of certain persons as a proof of their position.

A glance at history will show that the activities of man have changed with every alteration in the form of society, for, just as there has been change within the domain of the biological world, so there has been changes in the forms of society. At a very early period of man's history cannibalism was very often resorted to as a means of food supply, and was thought no more objectionable than eating the flesh of an ox or a sheep. The sex relationship of primitive man, although being quite in conformity with the current morality of the age, would shock the civilised person, and if anybody proposed their revival in modern society, either a prison cell or a lunatic asylum would greet their efforts. But, while there is a vast difference between the primitive savage and civilised man, the distinction lies in the fact that, while the former had but crude implements at his disposal to obtain the means of sustenance, the latter has inherited the results of the accumulated experiences of man's long and painful journey from savagery through barbarism to civilisation.

But, while the outlook and surroundings of modern man are different from those of his primitive ancestor, nevertheless, as far as the qualities that make up human nature are concerned, there is a similarity between both. For instance, we eat when we are hungry, and roar when we are angry. We seek the greatest amount of pleasure, and avoid pain and discomfort as much as possible, and the same qualities characterise the savage. The difference lies in the means employed to procure the food and the kind of pleasure sought; consequently, viewing human nature from this angle, we say that there is a sense in which human nature changes and a sense in which it is

always the same. The change of conditions, whether it be a change in the form of society or a change in the conditions of existing society, does not change the man, they only direct his natural qualities of adaptation into a different path. To illustrate this, we may take the recent war. Here we find the "peaceful citizen," who, while he shudders at the mention of a social revolution, because to him it means bloodshed, was converted from a man of peace into a man of war, and the greater the amount of blood of his opponents he shed, the more his conduct was commended.

The worker may notice how, when one of his mates has fallen upon more evil times, the helping hand of the shopmates has been extended towards the victim. In the most poverty-stricken slum the same factor of mutual aid can be observed in various directions. The daily Press reports frequently the news of some gallant act performed without hope of reward. It is a fact, as Kropotkin says in his book, "Mutual Aid," page 292:—

"Neither the crushing powers of the centralised state, nor the teachings of mutual hatred and pitiless struggle which came adorned with the attributes of science, from obliging philosophers and sociologists could weed out the feeling of human solidarity, deeply lodged in men's understanding and heart, because it has been nurtured by all our preceding evolution."

As we have already indicated, human nature is a complexity of qualities that can either be expressed harmfully or beneficially; it depends upon the conditions of its existence; and, as we have shown, that, with the change of conditions, there takes place a corresponding change in man's activities, we assert that with the change from Capitalism to Socialism, those various qualities which go to make up human nature, will be directed into different paths, and the workers, free from capitalist bondage, will thus enjoy the fruits of their labour and live a life of security and happiness.

R. REYNOLDS.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1, when regular delivery will be arranged.

"THE JAPS IN SIBERIA."

The above is the title of a leaflet published by the "National 'Hands off Russia' Committee.

It contains an introductory foreword over the signatures of Robert Williams, Ben Tillett, M.P., John Bromley, Neil Maclean, M.P., J. E. Mills, M.P., and Robert Smillie. The leaflet points out how the Ruling Class of Japan are endeavouring to obtain a foothold in Siberia by means of their armies and navies for the purpose of furthering their imperialistic ambitions. The leaflet describes that in the process, however, atrocities are being perpetrated by Japanese, which bring to mind the mediæval torture chambers.

We think there is nothing particularly unusual about these methods; they are merely typical of the long line of atrocities which have been inflicted by one capitalist power after another in their respective endeavours to monopolise markets and extend their fields of exploitation and plunder over the backward countries. Needless to say, in these adventures it has been the working class who have done the fighting; it is working-class lives which have been thus offered up as sacrifices in the interests of International Capitalism. Organisations like the "Hands off Russia" Committee may continue to publish leaflets like the above to the extent of millions of tons, but it does not touch the root of the matter; it is merely trifling with the effects of a particular system of society known as Capitalism. The mission of the Socialist Party, however, is to lay bare the general trend of Capitalist development; to point out unceasingly that, so long as the system lasts, atrocities will be repeated; that they are effects which spring from the very roots of the Capitalist system, because they are grounded in the soil of competitive rivalry for world's markets, trade routes, etc. The only remedy is to remove the cause, capitalism, and replace it by the International Co-operative Commonwealth.

Therefore, when the above-mentioned well-known Labour leaders write as follows in their introductory note to the leaflet—

"As Internationalist, we would urge the workers of Europe, America, the British Colonies, and the world generally, to do all that is possible to apply a boycott of all things Japanese until the Japanese troops are completely withdrawn from Siberia."

they are only confusing the issue by suggesting impossible things as remedies for a rotten system. Fancy the workers of the countries referred to boycotting Japanese articles! The workers will always endeavour to obtain the best value for their money. It is one of the guiding principles of the Capitalist system to strive for the best value obtainable in the ordinary course of exchange—i.e., buying and selling. It applies equally to the workers as it does to the capitalist. The worker receives wages and expends them to the very best advantage—i.e., in the purchase of the best value in the shape of the necessities of life. It matters not to him whether the goods he buys are Japanese, German, or Chinese—he seeks the best value for his money. He is bound to do this, or his power to work will deteriorate, and with it his chance of a job.

The capitalist seeks the highest degree of labour power which the labour market can produce; he wants the best value also.

Pious suggestions like the above melt in the air when they come into contact with the force of the facts mentioned.

But here is the cream of absurdity in the introductory note above referred to:—

"The workers of the West should spend tens of thousands of pounds in an active and well-directed propaganda amongst their fellow workers in the East, in order that the necessary and salutary pressure should be brought against the Eastern over lords of land and industrial capital."

We wonder what the millions of unemployed wage slaves of the Western world will have to say to this. Faced as they are with conditions which mean a scanty, meagre, semi-starved existence, to collect "tens of thousands of pounds" from the workers is a suggestion grotesque and impossible under the circumstances. These Labour leaders are either fools or liars.

Once again, therefore, we tell the workers that they must overthrow the system which makes possible such misery and suffering to their class, which causes wars and the horrors arising therefrom, famines, atrocities, starvation in the midst of plenty, and all the countless evils which beset the worker to-day.

Further, we claim to have found the remedy. We say it consists in ceaselessly striving to acquire an understanding of the forces at work, and the economic laws which govern the capitalist system.

Fellow-workers, as a counter-blast to the above-quoted confusion, get down to the solid work of understanding your class position, which Socialist knowledge alone makes clear. W. I.

A FEW WORDS ON "MINE" AND "THINE."

Many years ago, many thousands of years ago, when a man was hungry he took what he required and nobody interfered. Travellers' records are full of strange accounts of the native who, when on a long journey, walks into any hut met on the way, takes his fill from the pot on the fire, and takes himself off without anyone (except the civilised traveller) questioning his right to do so.

To-day, in any civilised country, if a hungry man takes what he requires (takes and holds!) he will be thrown into prison for taking what does not belong to him.

What a long and tortuous period of development lies between these two social stages! And yet how simple and natural and reasonable it appears to take and eat when one is hungry.

Why does the wielder of the baton stand between the hungry man and the food he requires? Because the hungry man would take what is not his to take—ah! there's the rub!

The problem that would puzzle a savage is—Why does food, one of man's principal requirements, become somebody's property; or why do things in general belong to particular sets of people, as, for example, ease and luxury to the masters, work and poverty to the workers? Why do *mine* and *thine* play such important parts in present-day affairs?

When a worker chances to put such questions he is belaboured with ponderous statements about foreign trade, supply and demand, wages of abstinence, cost of production, and hundreds of other things which he is solemnly assured are far above his capacity to understand and must be left to be worked out and settled by fat-headed high-brows whose sole aim in life is to attend to the well-being of the worker.

And yet it is really all very simple at the bottom. Thousands of Johns and Micks and Sams and Fritzs are all toiling in mines and factories, on the railways and on the seas, to obtain, fashion, and transport the

things man requires in order to live. But these obtainers, fashioners, and transporters must not take the smallest fraction of their product, but must pass over all they produce to a set of idlers. This set of idlers only return to the producers what will keep some of the latter alive, fit to work, and reproduce their kind. Why? Because many, many years ago the forerunners of the present set of idlers obtained, by various means, the right to privately own the land and practically all that is on and in the land—in a word, private ownership of the means of production. And this latter state of affairs still exists because the average worker accepts it as something divinely given or a law of nature.

Science, though aided with microscope and telescope, has been unable to find any divine law-giver or any room for his operations. Nature is bountiful and gives to no individual the right to privately monopolise anything. Man builds up these rights and man can abolish them.

The idle class are able to monopolise the wealth produced by the millions of toilers because the toilers accept as eternal the man-made laws of *mine* and *thine*.

Just as the air is free to all, so will the products of man's toil be free to all when the producer wishes it, as the means to accomplish this wish are at hand.

Delve deeply into this matter, fellow-worker; do not leave it to your self-appointed guides and guardians. It is your problem, and in its solution lies your social salvation.

GILMAC.

THE PARTY ANNUAL RE-UNION

will be held at

**Fairfax Hall, Portland Gardens,
Harringay, N.**

ON FRIDAY, APRIL 14th, 1922.

Doors Open 7 p.m.

Commence 7.30 p.m.

Tickets can be obtained from any
Branch Secretary See back

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 3s. 0d.
Six Months, post free... .. 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY



APR. 1, 1922

THE ENGINEERS LOCK-OUT.

For nearly two years there has been a rapid and persistent worsening of the conditions of life of the working class. In every industry there have been large reductions of wages, often accompanied by the extension of working hours. So enormous has this fall become that Dr. Macnamara stated (*Daily News*, 17th/2/1922) that wages had fallen in 1921 by £6,000,000 per week. That is over £300,000,000 per year! Geddes looks small beer alongside this, for while his Committee were trying to reduce Government expenditure by £100,000,000, the employers succeeded in "saving" more than three times that amount from wages.

Naturally the employers are feeling jubilant. The only serious attempt to stop this landslide in wages and conditions was the threat of the Triple Alliance last April in connection with the Miners' lock-out. The foul treachery of J. H. Thomas, Robert Williams, Frank Hodges, and the rest of the official crowd, who study so strenuously the interests of the masters when any dispute occurs, saved the situation for the employers, and prepared the way for further drastic reductions in wages on every hand.

Finding the workers in retreat on all fronts, the masters have now decided to try a "big offensive" in certain selected industries, with the deliberate intention of con-

tinuing this "offensive" in every industry till the standard of the workers as a whole has been forced far below the 1914 level.

For this purpose they have chosen to attack the Engineers directly, and allied industry of shipbuilders indirectly. The point of attack on the Engineers is on the matter of overtime that had been the subject of agreement in September, 1920. To talk of the need for "overtime" when millions are vainly seeking work is not Gilbertian, it is drivelling idiocy. Even the employers seem to recognise this, for they are stating that the issue is:—

"We are going to know where we are. We are going to manage the shops, or the shops are not going to be run. We are going to make it an absolute condition of employment for all hands" (Employers' statement, *Daily News*, March 20th, 1922.)

In the House of Commons Mr. A. Henderson quoted from a document the following instruction:—

"Men will have to resume work on conditions that we will lay down" (*Daily News*, March 21st, 1922).

The employers trot out these statements pompously and endeavour to convey the impression that it is a brand-new discovery they have made. In their bone-headed ignorance they have no idea that their argument is as old as the institution of private property in the means of life. In the antique civilisations and, centuries after, in the cotton fields of South America, the slave-owners claimed the right to do "as they liked with their own"—in these cases the chattel slaves. The Feudal barons bewailed the few manorial and guild restrictions as interfering with their liberty to do "as they liked" with the serf. And the early capitalists, Christian and Atheist alike, fiercely denounced any interference with the "liberty of the subject" when they dragged children of three years of age and upwards into the hell of mill and mine.

The employers certainly have logic on their side so far. All the wailing about the "cruelty" of the employers, in choosing a time suitable to themselves to enforce such conditions, is waste of breath and ink. Grant the right of private ownership of the means of life or of persons, then one cannot deny the "right" of the owner to "do as he likes with his own." But let us carry the argument a step further.

Upon examination it will be found that the employers only rely upon this "right"

so long as the workers accept it meekly. If, under the stress of want, the workers were to attempt to use the means of production for their own benefit, the masters would drop talking of "right" and would openly use the might they control. They would at once call in the forces of the State, and machine guns, aerial bombs, tanks and troops—à la the Rand—would be launched against the unarmed workers. Like so many other things to-day, "right" will be used by the employers as far as it suits their interests. When it fails to do this, then, like "humanity," "brotherly feeling," "mutuality of interests," and numerous other catchwords and phrases, it will be kicked aside with contempt.

Yet with all the present and past facts around them in overwhelming quantities to prove the truth of this point, the fakirs like Brownlie, Thomas, Clynes & Co. chatter about conciliation and the "duty" of the Government to intervene. Neither they, nor Sir Allan Smith, need turn a hair on this point. If the capitalists fancy their property is in any danger, then the Government will intervene with the speed of greased lightning.

Is the situation then entirely hopeless? To answer this question it is necessary to grasp clearly what the situation is. Despite the empty-headed rant of the Communist Party and of J. C. Gould and Sir Allan Smith, there is no disposition on the part of the mass of the workers to-day to "control production." The most demanded by the workers is that they shall have some say as to the details of the conditions under which they are to work. The situation then is one of conditions of employment. Once this is understood it becomes a matter of discussion as to what hope exists. On the one hand there are some firms outside the Masters' Federation. Sir Allan Smith and J. C. Gould may be taken as extremists of the latter organisation, but if the workers make a real attempt to put a brake upon the landslide that is taking place in the worsening of their conditions, there may be sufficient members of the Federation who would rather call a halt than face a real fight.

For one thing stands out clearly: Even if the masters win all along the line, if unlimited overtime is allowed and wages are reduced further, these things of themselves would not bring a single order into the

shops. In reference to the Shipbuilders' case, the *Daily News*, 9/2/1922, says:—

"It is not contended that the proposed reduction in wages will restore that part of the demand which has disappeared, because of the abnormal rate of world building since the Armistice, the operation of the reparation clauses requiring the handing-over of German ships, and the general slump in world trade."

How can the situation be tested? There is only one way. The organised workers must take united action to hold up industry. It is not a sectional question. The whole of the workers are involved, and if they remain divided, they will be attacked, and beaten, in detail by the employers. If the workers are prepared to stop the wheels of industry for the purpose of putting a check on this attack they must grasp the facts before them.

First, the stoppage must not be allowed to drag on indefinitely. If it does not effect its purpose in a short, sharp action, then it will have failed and the men must accept the inevitable for the present.

Second, it must be carried out peaceably. Any attempt at riot or destruction must be sternly repressed, as it would at once give the signal for the use of the armed forces against defenceless men. All nonsense about "taking possession of works, etc.," must be repudiated or ignored, as that way leads to disaster.

Third, the decisions to come out and to go back must be in the hands of the rank and file. No power should be given to leaders—revolutionary or otherwise—to decide these points.

Such action would cause practically no increase in the misery that already exists, and it would be a real test of the situation. And the hope of success within the limits laid down is at least such as to make the effort worth while.

But should this effort be successful, even then the workers would still have to realise that they are only fighting effects, while the cause of their troubles remains unaltered. That cause lies in the private ownership of the means of life—the land, mills, mines, factories, railways, canals, etc.—and the resulting enslavement of the non-owners, the property-less workers. This enslavement is maintained owing to the masters' control of political power whereby they can use the armed forces to protect their property. But this political power is placed in the masters' hands by the workers when at

each election—whether general or bye-election—they vote the supporters of capitalism into Parliament. It does not matter in the least whether that supporter be Sir Allan Smith or J. H. Thomas, Lord Devonport or Ben Tillett, the result is the same.

Not until the workers understand the above facts and organise to gain control of political power for the purpose of establishing the common ownership of the means of life, will the days of strikes and lock-outs be over.

AN OLD MAN IN A TUB.

"Mankind must either look for salvation from within or without. Hellenism and Christianity bid him look within. The Marxian Creed bids him look without and expect regeneration from the agency of material conditions." From Editorial, *Daily Telegraph*, January 7th, 1922.

Once upon a time there was an old man who lived in a tub. According to the most reliable reports got from almost totally unreliable historians, that strange old man didn't want much of the stuff of the earth. In the middle of a market he would sometimes stand still, look blandly upon the good things of Greece, and melodramatically exclaim, "Good Lord! how many things are there in the world of which Diogenes hath no need." Then he went again to his simple old home.

That is all I know of Diogenes, and all I care to know. He has always struck me as being a rather silly gentleman. Others seem to think him to have been a wise boy, and say (as Viscount Milner did in his address to the Classical Association, as the "Telegraph" did in its editorial comments on Milner's address) that if we were wise as he, Old Tubby, we wouldn't rush about on the earth for lamb chops and green peas and wines to wash 'em down, and clothes to keep ourselves warm, nor yet for houses . . . but instead we would get hold of a damned good book, soak our minds in sentimentality, forget almost we have bellies, and thereafter be content with plain living and high thinking.

That way of thinking won't do for us. Philosophy can help us a fair amount when we are in the thick of the natural and inevitable tragedies of life. Ordinarily, the human needs, physical needs, must be satisfied first. You may be idealistic; you may start life on oatmeal and water, and keep your pockets full of books; you may feed on

an abundance of moonlight and music and a minimum of boiled rice; you may sit out the nights over Plato, Socrates, and the rest of the old crowd of chatterers; you may be Godly, Philosophic, Poetic; you may do all that and be all that—for only a short time. At the end of 12 months your anatomy will be distinct as a tree in winter. You will probably get the sack for being slow, and perhaps in the end you will have to look out for an old tub. And I think I should laugh to see the wind whistle through you as it does through a bare tree.

Far as I can see, the old man in the tub was wrong. And Milner is wrong, and even the "Telegraph" is wrong. We can't successfully ignore the facts of our place in the scheme of the universe, nor the character of our particular make-up. Before we can enjoy anything—the fresh air, the colours in skies or in fields, human companionship or any sort of books done by wise or passionate men—we must have a certain amount of flesh on our bones.

Nowadays thousands of people are far too thin. They are too thin to think. They are hungry, ragged, haggard, and full of bitterness; but they are too thin to think. I will not now go into the sickening history of the workers. Those who suffer ought to know all about it. The awful curse of Capitalism was upon them from the first.

They have sweated in the pits and at the furnaces, and been heroic upon the seas. They have done weaving and made engines and ships. They have put numberless big buildings all over the country, and they have made some pretty good guns. But the people who have done all this are poor. And the monocled sensualist who would do anything to recover his youth, "except get up early in the morning, take exercise, or become a useful member of society," represents the class which, by its agents in Parliament, controls the guns which control you.

I haven't much more to say now.

Rub out all you have heard about politics. Try to get your second wind. If you don't, then the years will pass on as before—the shadow of Capitalism will be upon us all—the hate and sin and sorrow of this social system will go on, and millions of workers will be needlessly crushed and treated worse than the beasts of the field. If you want to laugh then you will have to get blind drunk.

Our way is the best way. We want all people to be free and happy. Our Object and our Principles are printed plainly as possible on the back page of the "S.S." If you won't trouble to read them and thoroughly consider them, I may as well dry up, for you won't be bothered with anything I say here. If you think the "Telegraph," Milner, and the Old Man in the Tub to be right, if the affairs of the world are nothing to you, then you will let the capitalists still own and control all the wealth and all the sources of wealth.

If you think Tubby's philosophy to be wrong,

P.T.O.
TO
BACK PAGE.

H. M. M.

THE MANTLE OF THE PROPHET.

"Yes! but shall we ever see Socialism in our time?" This is the finish of many a long discussion, when difficulty after difficulty has been met, when conviction is inescapable, the other chap wraps the diminished shreds of his prejudices about him, and says, sceptically: "Do you think we shall live to see it?" A simple, laconic "Yes" will obviously fail to carry conviction. He wants some details. He wants some reasons for the faith that is in us, and prosaically, perhaps, he wants to know if he will be there when the prizes are distributed. We beg to say, therefore, that unless Fate has marked us down for an early call, in our belief, Socialism is within measurable distance. These are our reasons.

First, let us have some definitions. The system of society with which we are familiar is called Capitalism. Its essential feature is the social tool, or machine, with which great numbers of human beings co-operate to produce that which humanity needs. These tools, or machines, are the property of a comparatively small number of individuals, who, by virtue of such ownership, take the whole of the product, returning to the labourers, on the average, just sufficient of the proceeds to enable them to support life and continue to work. The wealth produced to-day is produced for the market. When the home markets are filled up, the capitalist looks abroad for markets for the surplus.

It becomes, therefore, the anxious concern of those who own the social machinery—the capitalists—to obtain markets for this surplus. This is done by the partial interchange of products between capitalist countries in varying stages of development, by conquest and colonisation, and by the encouragement, often forcible, of non-capitalist nations to become customers for their goods.

Now, obviously, the continuity of a capitalist concern depends upon its ability to obtain and hold markets. Without markets it dwindles and dies. And, like a highly developed living organism, there is no standing still. It is either going forward or back. If it goes forward, it carries its own Nemesis with it; for among the products it must export are the very machines that will in turn make the market first self-supporting, and later into a competitor. If it go back, it automatically condemns to idleness, starvation, and possible insurrection the source of its own riches, the workers, without whom the whole of its machinery is so much scrap-iron.

It remains, then, but to consider how far Capitalism has travelled along that fatal road when its *effective* markets (not necessarily its possible markets) are saturated, and it stagnates for very surfeit. Here is where our questioner comes in, not too bored, let us hope, to follow but a little further, and not too exacting to ask us the precise date. One can only give indications and make rough approximations. Consider these facts. During the last ten years probably a hundred millions of people have died as a result of war, famine, and pestilence (influenza). Add to these the millions of unemployed in every capitalistic country. Think of the loss in productive capacity of those millions. Think of the loss as consumers. And yet, according to Chiozza Money, "our exports in January, commonly alleged to be desperately low, were as great in quantity as in 1900, a record year of boom trade thought remarkable not long before the war." ("New Statesman," February 25th.) He also mentions that in the two years 1919-1920 new capital issues amounted to £691,000,000.

We are told this is a period of bad trade, of depression, of decreased productivity, of poverty-stricken markets. What will it

mean when Capitalism gets going again; when trade revives; when France is "restored" and Germany gets on her feet; when India, China, Japan, and possibly Egypt come into the ring? C. E. Turner pointed out recently that one industry at least that is doing phenomenally well is that engaged in manufacturing textile machinery. Not for Lancashire. It is being shipped to France (for restoration), India, China, and Japan as fast as it can be produced. This is but an indication. What is the only possible inference from all these considerations? What other than that the present slump will be succeeded by a brief period of feverish lustle, of prodigious production, of tremendous effort, and then—and then, what? Markets choked, production stopped, unemployment colossal, and slump abyssmal.

These things will gradually awake the worker to a knowledge of his position. As the water wears the stone away, so the disappointments and sufferings will eventually wear away the workers' support of capitalism. In our opinion, human society is ripe for Socialisation now, immediately. It wants but a working class ready, willing, and, above all, organised, to take the means of human life out of the hands of those who now use them for individual gain and convert them into instruments for the common well-being. The opportunity arises at each General Election; for, as the capitalists conserve their power by their hold on the machinery of government, so, with the accession to power of a majority of workers' delegates, backed by an organised working class, can the people achieve that social ownership of its own means of life, which we call Socialism. This can be achieved in our time. This is within the compass of the present year. There is no need to await the brutal bludgeoning of the next slump, or the one after that. The first requisite is understanding; the next organisation; and then a realisation that they are best combined by joining the Socialist Party—now.

W. T. H.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.

Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

HOW "ABILITY" DIRECTS.

How often are we working men told that we have not the intelligence to "direct" industry; and that society would crumble to pieces were it not for the individuals who possess a wonderful faculty called by our masters Directive Ability? We are also assured that those possessing this marvellous—and very mysterious!—gift are only found within the ranks of the capitalist class.

Now and again ugly and awkward (for the capitalist) facts come out in connection with the running of particular concerns. At such times the capitalist directors (the alleged possessors of "directive ability"), hasten to disown responsibility for any of the irregularities charged against the company, and plead ignorance of its internal mechanism. On such occasions officials of the company (wage-slaves) are saddled with the whole of the responsibility.

A case in point was provided during the inquiry into the celebrated Putymayo Rubber atrocities, some years ago, in which Sir Roger Casement gave evidence. On the board of directors of the company, whose treatment of the natives formed the subject of the investigation, there were four English directors. When interrogated as to the company's doings these brainy gentlemen denied all knowledge of its operations and asserted that they did not even know the language in which the business at the meeting of directors was carried on!

However, even this direct information is not necessary to anyone who will give a few moments' thought to one side of the question—and a glance now and again at the company reports and prospectuses regularly printed in the papers. From the latter it will be noticed that the same individual's name appears on the boards of numerous companies. It will further be discovered that some of the companies are gigantic concerns with tentacles stretching out all over the world, and producing varieties of articles a knowledge of which requires training and specialisation to a very high degree. This being so, it should be obvious that an individual who was connected with such concerns could take a very minute part (assuming for the sake of argument that he does take a part) in the work of these companies.

The writer of this article has before him

a cutting from the "Daily News" (14/2/22) relating to the case of the City Equitable group of companies whose affairs are creating a financial stir at the present moment. From this cutting we learn that Mr. Gerard Lee Bevan, who was the chairman of the City Equitable Fire and the City Equitable Associated Companies, was also on the boards of the following companies:

Agricultural Industries, Ltd.; Burton Son and Sanders, Ltd.; Chilian Stores (Gath and Chaves), Ltd.; Clarke, Chapman & Co., Ltd.; H. and C. Grayson, Ltd.; Harrods (Buenos Aires), Ltd.; Leyland Motors, Ltd.; South American Stores (Gath and Chaves), Ltd.; Southern Brazil Electric Co., Ltd.

The capital of two of the above companies (Agricultural Industries, Ltd., and South American Stores) total round about £5,000,000. It will be observed that one of the above companies is connected with Agriculture, another with Petrol Motors, another with Electricity, and so forth. A man would need to be indeed a many-sided genius to handle such vast concerns! No wonder the poor fellow has made a mess of things and cleared out!

The truth of the matter, however, is that all the direction of industry performed by these self-styled directors concerns the direction of the profits into the appropriators' pockets.

The whole of industry, in all its ramifications, occupies in the actual production and distribution of wealth only those whose title gives the key to their social position—the working class. How are they rewarded? Perhaps the following quotation will form a fitting conclusion to these few remarks (taken from the "Daily News," 10/2/22):

"A case which has been resumed at intervals for the last 30 years has been brought once more before the First Paris Court of Appeal.

M. Eugene Turpin, the inventor of melinite, and of many other contrivances, is endeavouring to recover damages from all persons who have used his invention. M. Turpin is still a relatively poor man, although since 1881 he has brought out at least 40 inventions."

The above inventor can take his place with the galaxy of inventors (including General Shrapnel, who died in poverty in the early stages of the war) who have made possible the rapid expansion of wealth which has brought with it intrigue and wire-pulling (misnamed "directive ability") of the wealthy financiers.

GILMAC.

DIRECT ACTION IN S. AFRICA.

The recent attempts on the part of the Rand miners at Johannesburg to gain their ends by force of arms affords another striking instance of the futility of adopting such methods in the face of the organised, well-disciplined force of the governing class. Into the *pros* and *cons* of this particular case we do not propose to go. The broad facts of the case are sufficient for our purpose. In the mining districts of South Africa we find the masters organising for wage reductions; in fact, throughout the Capitalist world the same thing is going on all round. In England we had the coal mine owners making the first grand onslaught towards wage reductions. The Engineering industry at the present moment witnesses another great move on the part of the masters to force a reduction of wages.

In both instances the workers have been locked out. In all these contests we have the advocates of direct action on the industrial field proclaiming that this is the appointed time for the workers to use their "industrial power." These people do not explain what this industrial power of the workers is. The reason is simple—there is no such thing as this so-called "industrial power" or "economic power," as some prefer to call it; it is just a phrase, mouthed about by "revolutionary" Labour leaders, to impress their sheep-like followers with their "revolutionary heroism." "Industrial power," "the power of industry," "economic power," are meaningless terms so far as advantage to the workers' cause is concerned.

The fact that has to be solidly grasped is that a ruling class exists to-day—the owners and controllers of the means of life. It matters not under what national banner or flag these captains of industry—the Capitalist class—are domiciled, whether it be in South Africa, Australia, America, the same force is used—the army, navy, and aerial contingents—to impose the masters' will over the subject class, the working class. Therefore, while the workers of the world remain politically ignorant—i.e., vote their enemies into the seat of power—then it logically follows that that power, which gives them control of the forces of the State, will be used whenever occasion demands, as witness on the Rand in South Africa.

As a writer in the *Manchester Guardian*, 17/3/22, says, commenting on the matter—

"There certainly has been no indecision about General Smut's way of taking up a clear challenge; not, of course, that the challenge from the rioters on the Rand was personal to him. He received it as the chosen head man of the *European Democracy in South Africa*. It was no individual will, but the will of the majority—evidently a vast majority—of South African voters."

In this case the "vast majority" in their political ignorance voted for the return to the seat of power—the State Assembly—representatives of the owners of property in land, mines, railways, etc. Therefore, when this property is attacked by bands of rebel workers, it is naturally defended by the forces of the State.

Now listen to the champions of "industrial action"—"Workers' Dreadnought" (18/3/22)—commenting on the South African trouble:—

"Labour will not be victorious whilst it merely strikes and starves. It must take control of production and distribution before it can achieve anything."

We agree, but we are not told how the workers are to get control. Also same authority commenting on the Engineers' lock-out:—

"They must show themselves able and ready to supply their own needs and those of the proletarian community as a whole."

We agree, but how? And further same authority:—

"The questions the locked-out workers have to ask themselves are just these:—

1. 'Why should we suffer want in a land of plenty?'
2. 'How can we avoid doing so?'

The answer to No. 1 is that the workers will continue to suffer want, so long as the means of life are owned by a few—the ruling Capitalist class.

The question as to how this state of things may be avoided is readily answered by the Socialist, who claims that the means of life must be made the common property of the people—i.e., by the establishment of Socialism, viz., "a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community." The Declaration of Principles on the back page of this issue sets out concisely but clearly how that object may be attained.

Revolutionary wind may be very relieving to people like the writer in the

"Workers' Dreadnought," quoted above; there's been an epidemic of it since Bolshevism was discovered in Russia. What the workers need is Revolutionary knowledge. Study our position and then act.

B. I.

KNOWLEDGE IS POWER:—IF.

We often hear the above remark indiscriminately used by people claiming to be teachers in certain branches of knowledge. To the Socialist, however, accustomed as he is to viewing things according to their relative value to his class, the above phrase taken alone would not be likely to arouse much enthusiasm; for the first question he would probably ask would be, What kind of knowledge? One has to watch the roadway of a great bridge rise and fall, to stand beneath a mammoth ocean liner slowly creeping away from the quay, to see the wheels of production and distribution in motion in any large manufactory, to realise that the worker, who alone operates and makes possible this fabulous wealth, MUST POSSESS KNOWLEDGE, and of many distinctive and technical kinds, too; and yet he is a slave—cap in hand, often begging permission to be allowed to bring into being these very things. Obviously, there is some other knowledge he requires, for to what purpose is his knowledge if it but fetters him with chains of slavery? As William Morris wrote:—

"Faster and faster our iron master,
The thing we make for ever drives,
Bids us grind treasure and fashion pleasure,
For other hopes and other lives."

The knowledge necessary to set in motion or harness Nature's most terrible forces merely obtains for the worker, upon the average, subsistence for wife and children, and not always that. The power such knowledge confers upon him is the power to produce and distribute the wherewithal upon which society has its being; luxury and affluence for a set of parasitic idlers; want, anxiety, and premature death for millions of his own class. NO! there is yet one part of his mental equipment that is lacking, and that is the knowledge that he is a slave. The fact that he is no longer a bonded, but a wage or salaried one, does not make his servitude any the less real and complete, and honest introspection would compel admittance of this fact. It may or

may not be true that "a little learning is a dangerous thing"—certainly as far as the Socialist is concerned, if that knowledge be CORRECT, he sees anything but danger to the working class, especially when it is consciously directed towards their ultimate goal—Socialism.

Every member of the Party commenced with a relatively small amount of knowledge, usually dearly bought in the hard school of working-class experience; but he knows that such a step inevitably leads to the desire to study and enlarge that knowledge. Unfortunately, the convert to Socialism is often inclined to enthuse over anything that is supposed to call for working-class activity and support; he is fired with zeal and interest in matters which, a later and clearer perception will teach, are about as much to do with the Socialist objective as the programme of the Labour Party or the constitution of the I.L.P. is. It by no means follows that he should not endeavour to understand each and every phase of political activity, but a clear understanding of his Socialist position IS FIRST NECESSARY to enable him to analyse and explain the uselessness of such and such a movement to his class. No member of the Labour Party could show that even the realisation of the whole of their programme would confer the slightest permanent benefit upon the workers; they can only impress and delude the politically ignorant. Mere eagerness to do something without an objective, which is the result of scientific deduction, may even be in a direct line to perpetuate decadent capitalism. All reforms are a standing example of such waste of effort as far as Socialism is concerned. The writer well remembers his association with the working-class movement before coming in contact with the principles of the S.P.G.B., and his support then of the Suffragette movement and certain reformist parties. He remembers wasting much time, and with great patience attempting to assimilate the spurious economics of Marshall, Jevons, Shaw, etc., with other voluminous works not of first importance to students of Socialism, without, at the time, being fortunate enough to have had put in his way pamphlets and writings of Marx and Marxian Socialists.

It is often easier to instruct and help members of the working class in obtaining

real Socialist knowledge who have NOT imbibed some half-baked unscientific notions of the so-called "Communist" and other organisations, seeking the support of the workers, than it is with those who, though professing Socialists, are confused, and, in reality, unconsciously enemies of the working class. Before one can lay any claim to the name of Socialist, it is essential that an understanding be based upon a scientifically drawn-up foundation; only then can the worker discard false conceptions and avoid the errors so common to the pseudo and the sentimental reformer.

That foundation is to be found in the principles of the Socialist Party. There, in simple, working-class language, is the guide to action. Once understood, no matter how brilliant the oratory or rhetoric, or how touching the appeal may be that is made by people who claim that their heart bleeds for the worker—he will know that there is one way, and ONE WAY ONLY, to working-class emancipation, and that is the way of class-conscious concerted action by the workers themselves. That is the knowledge that will enable the workers to obtain the power to wrest, by their political supremacy, the means to the glorious heritage that awaits them. Without that knowledge, however much skill and dexterity they may possess as workers, they remain slaves, by reason of the ignorance of their position in society. Once a majority obtain that knowledge, the advent of the Socialist Commonwealth is at hand. Fellow-workers, join with us; the smallest effort helps to speed the day.

MAC.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE.

The EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE of the Party will be held on

APRIL 14th and 15th, 1922,
At Fairfax Hall, Portland Gardens,
Harringay.

Proceedings will commence at 10 a.m.
each day.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC. ADMISSION FREE.

£1,000 FUND LIST unavoidably held over
owing to lack of space.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spicel-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.8. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Sec., 142 Bulwer-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER AND DISTRICT.—Communications to Sec., 11 Davis-st., Longsight, M/C. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Sundays, at 3 p.m.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Monday at 7, at 107, Charlotte Street, W.1. Communications to Sec., 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. Discussion after branch business.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 3, Lyveden-rd., Tooting, S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays, at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 19, Beechfield-rd., Finsbury Pk., N.4. Branch meets Saturdays 8.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN. Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS
 LONDON DISTRICT.
Sundays:

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
 Edmonton, Silver Street, 11.30 a.m.
 Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
 Stratford, Vicarage-lane, 7.30 p.m.
 Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 a.m.
 Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
 Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m.
 Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.
 Wimbledon Broadway, 8 p.m.

Fridays:

Tottenham, Junction Clyde-road and Phillip-lane, 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.
 Tooting, Undine-street, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.; and
 Printed by R. E. TAYLOR & SON, LTD., 55/57, Banner Street, London, E.C.1.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.
OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.
THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain
HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 213. Vol. 18.]

LONDON, MAY, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

A UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR ON MARX.

A Review of "The Revival of Marxism," by J. Shield Nicholson, Sc.D., L.L.D., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Edinburgh. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, W. 1920.

In his 140 pages of ambiguous University jargon, Professor Nicholson pretends to deal with most of the socialist principles. His so-called arguments are not by any means new, and in some respects are quite inferior to those of the poorly-paid orators of the anti-socialist union and the property defence leagues. It is necessary, however, to examine the more important—if it is possible to choose anything that is important from a mass of quibbles and trivialities.

"The Materialist Conception of History" is one of the first principles which this professor attacks. Twice he attempts to destroy it. The first time, on page 8, he merely strengthens it by his admissions. He says:—

"Any manifestation of idealism at present seems to be associated with internationalism. Not that the internationalism that is now fashionable is free from the materialistic taint. On the contrary, it is mainly concerned with the restoration of trade and of sound monetary conditions."

On page 119 a second attempt is made on the materialist conception of history in the following words:—

"Material fatalism of this kind is the suicide of reason—the deletion from humanity of its vital character."

"The history of progress—economic, as well as of other forms of progress—is the history of the conflict of great ideas. Moral progress is the history of the conflict of great ideals. Material fatalism of this kind is a reversion to intellectual and moral barbarism."

If Professor Nicholson were to enumerate

some of his great ideas it would be possible to show him their obvious connection with economic conditions. If he told us of some of the great ideals that were in conflict in the moral sphere, we might easily point to their connection with material factors. He does neither of these things, nor does he attempt to show how ideas or ideals can exist apart from a materialistic basis. To put forward an opinion which is not substantiated in any way is one of the methods Professor Nicholson employs to shuffle out of the conflict he himself raises, but is neither criticism nor analysis.

On the "Marxian Theory of Value" Professor Nicholson is particularly illuminating. On page 26 he says:—

"The Marxian theory of value was soon shattered by destructive criticism. It is absurd to suppose that Marx discovered certain ideas of value which were neglected by subsequent economists."

"It is still more absurd to suppose that economists wilfully suppressed the teaching of Marx because they were supporters of Capital against Labour. From J. S. Mill onwards, the bias, if there has been any bias, has been the other way."

Then in a footnote the Professor says:—

"Marshall shows that Ricardo and the eminent Ricardian economists were not opposed to the Factory Acts. Even Senior repented his first hasty disapproval."

The average man will confess a difficulty in seeing the connection between Senior's repentance and the Marxian theory of value; yet Nicholson never gets much closer than this to the theory he promises to explode. Statements like the above and abusive remarks about the conceit of Marx make up quite a large portion of his work.

Another charge that Nicholson makes against Marx is, that his reasoning is involved, contradictory, and difficult to understand. Let the reader examine the following from the Professor's work and then try and find something in the works of Marx to equal it:—

"To measure the values of things in terms of labour would obviously be impossible unless we can reduce all the kinds of labour to one common kind. This leads up to the idea of 'socially necessary labour,' which is quite unintelligible unless expressed in unreal hypothesis." (Page 75.)

How that which is "unintelligible" can become intelligible when expressed in "unreal hypothesis" the professor does not say. He missed a golden opportunity by failing to expose either the unreality or the fallacy of "socially necessary labour." He does not do this, no doubt because directly anyone examines the idea of either "socially necessary labour" or the "reduction of all kinds of labour to one common kind" they are so clear and their applicability so apparent, that once stated it would puzzle even a University professor to controvert them.

Here is another example of Nicholson's method. He says:—

"But labour with Marx is not only the real measure, but the real determinant of value."

"If, however, labour as the real measure of value is absurd, labour as the sole real determinant of value is still more absurd."

It will be noticed that there is no attempt here, either at analysis or argument. Neither here, nor anywhere else in the book, does Nicholson show that the amount of socially necessary labour contained in a commodity does not determine its value. When he attempts to do so there is no "if" about his absurdity. He says:—

"The exchange values of things, whether we take long periods or short periods, depend on a variety of real causes, and any change in one or more of them will bring about a change in the resultant value of the thing."

"Among these causes is the amount of labour required to produce the thing."

"In general, in any product, there are very different qualities of labour concerned."

"And not only is labour required, but all sorts of auxiliary capital."

As can be seen at a glance, labour of different qualities can be reduced to labour of the simplest kind merely by comparison. If, for instance, a commodity were produced solely by two men, the labour-power of the one being paid for at the rate of two shillings per hour and the other at one shilling

per hour, and if the two men each worked on the commodity two hours, the amount of labour-power contained could either be reckoned as two hours of skilled plus two hours simple labour or as six hours of simple labour. The wages paid, six shillings, would be the same either way. Marx contends that this is done whenever the prices of commodities are compared, no matter how diverse the qualities of the labour-power embodied in them. As Nicholson shirks this question, although referring to it in passing, it must be taken for granted that he could find no fault with it.

Next among the variety of real causes is "all sorts of auxiliary capital." But whether capital is auxiliary or principal, it is capital just the same—that is, wealth used for exploitation. Thus of all the "variety of real causes on which exchange value depends," according to Nicholson, only two can be shown, i.e., different kinds of capital and different kinds of labour, or at bottom simply capital and labour. As capital, in whatever form it appears, is wealth, it follows that it must have been produced by the application of human energy to the nature-given material. Professor Nicholson's enumeration of his variety of real causes, when advanced this one logical step further, lands him in the same boat with Marx. He knows that every intelligent reader will see this, so he promises to show the absurdity of it in his next chapter on the accumulation of capital and in the chapter on profits. In the first of these chapters he argues that capitalism is not all a black record of evil. "On the contrary," he says, "the growth of capitalism through the ages has also been one of the agents in the general advance of civilisation." Obviously, this does not disprove the statement that "capital in all its forms is congealed or crystallised labour." Neither does it prove anything to the credit of capitalism. War is one of the agents in the general advance of civilisation, yet the sooner it is abolished the better for the human race.

The only thing in the chapter on accumulation of capital that can be construed into having any connection with capital as "congealed or crystallised labour" is the following quotation and certain deductions made by the professor:—

"The conditions of production are also those of reproduction. No society can go on producing; in

other words, no society can reproduce, unless it constantly reconverts a part of its products into means of production. . . . Hence a definite portion of each year's product belongs to the domain of production. Destined for productive consumption from the very first, this portion exists, for the most part, in the shape of articles totally unfitted for individual consumption." Capital, vol. I., page 578.

Professor Nicholson comments on this as follows:—

"Labour power must be devoted to the continuous upkeep of the means of production, if the flow of consumable goods is to be continually forthcoming."

He then goes on to argue that there must be changes in the forms and amounts of "productive capital" just as in the forms of "productive labour" if we are to have improvement in the quality of things and continuous substitution of new forms of wealth for old, and then he says:—

"Many passages might be quoted from Marx in which he assents to these general propositions regarding the connection of labour and capital."

With real cunning, however, Nicholson neglects to quote the short passage immediately following the previous quotation, which reads as follows:—

"If production be capitalistic in form, so, too, will be reproduction. Just as in the former the labour-process figures, but as a means towards the self-expansion of capital; so in the latter, it figures, but as a means of reproducing as capital—i.e., as self-expanding value—the value advanced. It is only because his money constantly functions as capital that the economical guise of a capitalist attaches to a man."

Thus, an attempt to use short passages from Marx to justify capitalist methods, or institutions, is frustrated at once by anyone who refers to "Das Capital," and reads the passage together with its context.

In his chapter on profits, Nicholson, instead of exploding Marxian fallacies, as he promised, engages in a somewhat dreary discourse on the false economy of low wages, saying:—

"Everyone can see that a certain minimum must go to labour if its mass and its efficiency is to be kept up. If not, the labour will emigrate or die out."

And, of course, capital must have its maximum, or that too will emigrate, from which Nicholson argues that:—

"Insurance against risk is the second element in the usual analysis of gross profits."

A principle which is developed to such an extent that the bulk of capitalist con-

cerns run little or no risk of failure, and can no longer be described as enterprises.

Throughout the book Professor Nicholson drearily complains that Marx, in his analysis, takes no account of demand. Following in the path of Jevons and Hobson, he holds that supply and demand, marginal utility, etc., are the main factors in prices. Although he pretends to have read the works of Marx, and frequently quotes from them, he purposely shuns those portions where Marx explains, in scientific fashion, the real part played by supply and demand in causing temporary fluctuations in price.

The general attitude of Professor Nicholson throughout the book might be summed up in the following paragraph, written by himself and appearing on page 131:—

"In the complications of modern industry the right of each to the product of his own labour takes the form of the right to the share he can bargain for with the other contributors. He may make his bargain collectively or individually, but the general rule is that the greater the gain the greater the exertion."

In other words, those who work the hardest get the most. No wonder that Marx wrote:—

"Once for all I may here state, that by classical political economy, I understand that economy which, since the time of W. Petty, has investigated the real relations of production in bourgeois society, in contradistinction to vulgar economy, which deals with appearances only, ruminates without ceasing on the materials long since provided by scientific economy, and there seeks plausible explanations of the most obtrusive phenomena, for bourgeois daily use; but for the rest, confines itself to systematising in a pedantic way, and proclaiming for everlasting truths, the trite ideas held by the self-complacent bourgeoisie with regard to their own world, to them the best of all possible worlds."

Which sums up, in a single sentence, not only Professor Nicholson but Jevons, Hobson, Marshall, and all the crowd of professional sycophants who prostitute themselves for wealth and position because truth and science does not pay in the sphere of politics.

F. F.

AN ECONOMIC CLASS

will be held by

BATTERSEA BRANCH, S.P.G.B.

at

16, Creek Street, York Road, Battersea,

EVERY MONDAY EVENING at 7.30 p.m.

Commencing Monday, 3rd April, 1922.

"A WORLD COMMONWEALTH."

To the organised workers of the world remains the ultimate task of establishing the greatest of all systems of society. It is the supreme purpose, and can be stated thus: taking the two essential factors—the world and its inhabitants—to realise to the fullest the means of the well-being and happiness of the whole of humanity.

The history of the ages can be depicted as a series of connected social systems evolving one from another, in each of which the mode of wealth-production is the chief consideration determining the character and structure of that system.

Man needs food, clothing, and shelter. All are derived from the planet on which he lives by the application of labour-power usefully exercised. Without these things he perishes; if insufficiently obtained, he suffers. Without labour they are unobtainable. They minister to his physical and mental needs. Man has a many-sided, complex nature. The more highly developed society becomes, the greater the need for the co-operative efforts of the units composing it.

Man can only develop his finest social instincts, his best physical and mental qualities, in a society whose members are free. Otherwise those potentialities, both in society and its units, are thwarted or stunted. Man's chief usefulness is in contributing to the social wealth.

In the broadest sense, all that ministers to humanity's physical and mental needs, advantages, and enjoyments, can be considered as social wealth.

But to-day we find that society is, roughly, divided into two classes with *conflicting interests*. This has been brought about through the historic development since primitive times. It arises from the fact that the ownership and control of the *means of living* are in the hands of one class. Wealth is socially produced, but the wealth itself is privately owned and controlled by the capitalist class.

The much larger class in society—the working class—does not own nor control the means of living. The function it fulfils is to act as wealth-producer for the class that owns. The workers own nothing but their potential energy of brain and hand: and through their efforts, alone, all wealth is produced.

The master class do nothing useful whatsoever in the process of wealth production.

The working class thus exist under the present system in a *state of slavery*. Theirs to produce commodities for sale in the market. They are "wage-slaves," who receive in "wages" but a small portion of the values they produce—on the average but a bare subsistence wage. The surplus-value they produce in factory or workshop is only realised for the capitalist by sale in the market. It is represented by Rent, Interest, and Profit.

Being used to produce surplus-value, the working class are thus exploited and robbed of the product of their toil. The result to the workers is seen in their chronic poverty and misery, unemployment, disease, overwork, and a host of evils inevitably springing from the system itself—the result of production for "profit" for the benefit of a class. But to that class who exploit them it means an ever-increasing affluence, luxury, and idleness.

Now the main reason why the capitalist class are thus to own and control the very lives of the workers is because they are in possession of *political power*, and use it for their class-interests alone.

The solution, then, is obvious! When once the workers of the world become conscious of their slavery, they will *organise as a class* to capture the powers of Government in order to emancipate themselves. Once in possession of that, and its adjuncts—the armed forces—they will use it as a means of establishing an entirely new system of society—*Socialism*. Under their administration all the means of wealth production and distribution will be owned and controlled by the whole community—wealth being produced then for the use and enjoyment of all!

The class-division will thus be automatically abolished, as the essential interests of all its members are one and the same. Thus, and thus only, will be assured the *means* for the well-being and happiness of the members of society as a whole; and the evils of wage-slavery will be ended with their root cause—Capitalism. So we see that the realisation of the greatest social system depends on the organised efforts of a class-conscious, determined *working class*. Theirs to free themselves and secure the means of comfort, equality, and freedom for all.

Hence the clarion call of Karl Marx: "Wage-workers of all countries, unite! You have nought to lose but your chains; you have a world to win!" J. G. M.

"THE FUTURE OF INDUSTRY."

In the "Glasgow Herald" (January 25th, 1922) appeared an article with the above title, reporting a speech by the Lord Advocate of Scotland addressed to the Reading Circle of Palmerston Place United Free Church, Edinburgh. The title is one which can be found heading many of the speeches and writings of members of the master class and their satellites.

In his speech the Lord Advocate states:—

"To-day, millions of unemployed had the right to ask by what road had they reached the present pass."

To whom does the Lord Advocate refer the unemployed millions for answer to this question? He does not say. The best individual the worker can put that question to is himself, but somewhat in the following manner: Why are there two opposing classes in present-day society, working class and master class, whose interests clash very bitterly?

Suppose a worker asks the question that the Lord Advocate states he has a right to do, and the questioner goes to a capitalist or his agent, he will be given quite a number of alleged reasons. The main reason that is put forward by the masters at the moment is that the War is the cause of the trouble, and that to put matters right capital and labour must come together to work with a spirit of goodwill, and that all the suspicion and distrust that exists between them must be dropped. This point of view was put forward by Mr. Vernon Hartshorn in the House of Commons on April 5th, 1921.

"I want to say that in my opinion the first essential to that end is for the Government to act in relation to this problem in such a manner as to eradicate from the minds of the miners what has become a deep-rooted conviction, namely, that the Government are in league with the owners to thwart the ambitions and the aspirations of the miners, and to side with the employers; rightly or wrongly, that conviction is deep-rooted in the minds of the miners." (Par., Debates No. 32, Vol. 140.)

In these few words it is not difficult for one to read what is evidently intended—that the existing conflict which is being perpetually waged must be smothered by

some means. This particular working-class misleader was not prepared to openly attack the masters, who were supported by the Government, as witness the following:—

"We think the time has now come when a proper relationship should be re-established between the owners and the workmen."

A quotation from another misleader will be informing in this connection. The following is a statement by Mr. Brace in the House of Commons on October 19th, 1920:—

"It would not be helpful to the welfare of the State to have a fight to the finish; neither would it be so for the Federation, or for the Government. I say quite frankly that if the State has made up its mind, its resources are sufficient to defeat the Miners' Federation. Suppose you drive the Miners' Federation back to a defeated people, a disgruntled, soured and bitter people, what then becomes of the output? It is output you want. Unless we get a greater output the supremacy of this nation, as a first-class commercial and industrial power, must disappear. Therefore, let us get into an atmosphere of not desiring either to defeat the Government or to humble a great organisation like the Miners' Federation. . . . Therefore we make affirmation, that it is our belief that a larger output is essential to the well-being of the country; we also declare that the output can be maintained by mutual goodwill between owners and workmen. . . . We would agree to the setting up of National and District Committees in order to obtain increased output. What does that mean? It means that the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, as an organisation, would agree to make it their hourly, daily, and weekly business by way of co-operation to produce coal." (Par., Debates No. 120, Vol. 133.)

It is evident that, should a member of the working class approach one of these agents of capitalism, he would not receive a clear explanation of the cause of, and remedy for, the industrial troubles. These people are clearly concerned with enjoining the worker to produce more, and, according to Mr. Brace, the miners must work with the mineowners with this particular object in view.

It is only from the Socialist that a correct explanation of the cause of the evils of Capitalism can be obtained. If the reader will turn to the Declaration of Principles printed on the back page of this paper the cause of, and remedy for, working-class poverty and misery will be found briefly set forth.

If workers will give the matter a little examination, they will realise that they, as a class, are quite propertyless; that those who own the mines, mills, and so forth do not work in them; that all the wealth pro-

duced is the result of the application, by the working class, of their energies to the nature-given material.

Now, Fellow-Worker, it is your class who performs the task of wealth production in modern society. When that is done, do you and your mates own the wealth which you collectively have produced? Of course not; but why not? Because the capitalists, owning the means of production, are enabled to take from you the wealth you produce. You have no other way of gaining access to the means of life except by working for the capitalist.

It must be borne in mind that the masters do not give the workers permission to work out of love or fellow-feeling. Workers are engaged in the production of food, clothing, and shelter, not because the community require these things, but in order that the owners of these things shall obtain a profit. Profit is what the masters want, and it does not matter to them how sorely people may be in need, there will be no production unless there is profit to be obtained.

Consequently the future of industry under Capitalism will mean increased profit to the capitalist and increased toil and misery to the workers.

W. E. B.

UNDER THE IRON HEEL.

During the Big War, on one occasion when a crowd was dispersed in Turin for demanding bread, by the simple expedient of dropping bombs on them from airplanes, the present writer gave it as his opinion that this method would be resorted to in future disputes between the oppressors and the oppressed, and that this occasion marked its introduction as a permanent feature under capitalism. Events since then have fully born out that statement.

Wherever we turn—India, Egypt, Africa, in fact, any place where "rebellion" is in progress—there you will find this latest instrument of slaughter freely used. So far, this method has not been employed in this country, but it is not too much to say that if the capitalist class take it into their heads that this method is the best and most effective for producing "order," its introduction will not be long delayed. A few mass meetings of the out-of-works and strikers, and the unemployment problem would be solved!

Its use on the Rand, where hundreds of

Trade Unionists were in the midst of a trade dispute which had developed into a test of violence, is sufficiently recent to be remembered.

However justifiably workers may have acted in taking any particular line, the point to be remembered is that the master class is determined to smash up such efforts, and will not scruple to use any means to effect that end.

The writer has been asked his opinion regarding the scenes depicted in the novel by Upton Sinclair, "King Coal," as to whether they were, or were not, exaggerated. Readers of that book will remember that Mr. Sinclair describes the system supposed to be in operation in the mining districts of the Western States, where hired thugs, spies, and other evils are employed by the capitalists against the workers. I gave it as my opinion that these evils were in no way exaggerated, and recent reports from the States confirm the correctness of that opinion.

The mine owners in West Virginia seem determined to stamp out the movement for organising the workers into the United Mine Workers' Union. More than 45,000 miners are already enrolled in this Union, and the organisers were determined to get another 45,000 non-unionists in. These are mostly located in the Logan and Mingo counties, where, it seems, the mine owners are in complete command of the county administration, with the sheriffs also in their pay. As most of the houses tenanted by the miners are owned by the companies, naturally the first thing the latter did was to threaten with eviction every man joining the Union.

This they did, utilising for the purpose detectives of the Baldwin-Felt Agency, who are notorious gunmen. Fights were the result, with loss of life on both sides. On one occasion, during a march of Union men, they were met by troops and mine guards, which resulted in a battle in the mountains lasting for days.

Whenever things are not lively enough for the gunmen, they proceed to "shoot up" a town or two in order to strike terror into the hearts of the miners and their families. The State Attorney-General himself admits that the mine owners hold the entire machinery of administration in their grip, so that the miners in their quest for "justice" find themselves "up against it"

at every turn. The latest reports show that efforts are being made to have the United Mine Workers declared an illegal association! ("Manchester Guardian," 28/10/21.)

Another account, taken from the "Toiler" (New York), says:—

"The mines, stores, churches, schools, hospitals, homes, Press, and the entire governmental machinery are owned outright by the coal barons. The salaries of deputy sheriffs are paid by the operators, and the State Constabulary is picked from lists prepared by them. All the mining area is under the domination of the Baldwin-Felt Detective Agency's gunmen and murderers. These armed guards watch the pay rolls, collect rents, evict workers, run miners out of town, and serve as general thugs and hangmen for the capitalists. The workers are robbed going and coming. . . any defiance of this system of slavery, any sign of workers' resistance, is met with club, bayonet, and machine-gun. . . Finally, Harding was appealed to for a conference. In reply to this appeal came Federal troops, aeroplanes, gas bombs, and machine-guns to crush the workers." (Quoted from the *Worker*, Brisbane, 2/2/22.)

Very similar to this was the way in which the workers were treated during the recent strike in the San Joaquin oilfields of California. After striking against the reduction of a dollar a day and the abolition of the Arbitration Board, they found themselves up against a very formidable and well-organised resistance. The strikers themselves formed a body of pickets, whose business it was to see that no strike breakers were brought into the district, and at the same time to prevent any disorder taking place, so that a straight fight on principle could be waged. This, however, was futile. Guards were rushed in and the Press made the most of the affair—in the interests of the bosses, of course. Like the West Virginia coal owners, the oil companies had their hired thugs and spies, who conducted their operations clandestinely. Appeals to the Government were useless, and the strikers soon found themselves down and out, with the result that the strike collapsed and the men decided to return to work without having secured any advantage. When they offered to return, however, they were informed that they were not needed. It was then discovered that a very elaborate system of blacklisting had been prepared during their absence. Each company apparently possessed full particulars of every applicant for work, and on every occasion he was turned away. This soon had the effect of creating a large body of moneyless, jobless men. To make matters worse, the strikers soon

discovered that the names on the black list had been circulated by the companies among the traders of the town, so that it was an impossibility to obtain credit. As in most disputes, the Press endeavoured to show that the trouble was due to the agitation set up by the Bolsheviks, Socialists, and what not. Raids made on the homes of individuals resulted in the finding of quantities of seditious literature, which, as is usual in such cases, had been carefully concealed beforehand by the "finders." These facts I have taken from "The Golden Age," Brooklyn, N.Y. (15/2/22).

Altogether, what has been reported lately from the various industrial centres of America leads me to believe that what Sinclair said was rather under-estimated, if anything.

One needn't be surprised, of course, at any of these things. They are not confined to America. The same class is in possession everywhere, and everywhere its methods are the same. It follows that there is only one cure—Socialism.

TOM SALA.

£1,000 FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Already Acknowledged	725	17	9½
Donations:—			
Buckingham, P.		7	6
W. Cross		2	6
Mrs. C. & G.	1	0	0
Islington Branch	1	5	0
"W.H."	1	0	0
"H."	1	0	0
Central Branch	3	0	0
Stamp Books:—			
Hackney Branch, 1		4	0
Tottenham, 10, 11		6	0
Battersea Branch, 23, 5/-; 46, 6/-; 47, 6d.; 48, 16/-	1	7	6
Tooting Branch, 44		3	6
Proceeds from Opera Lecture	1	7	0
Collection at Party Meeting		5	0
Balance for Gramophone		5	0
	£794	12	9½

All comrades and sympathisers with any "loose" to spare should forward same immediately to the Secretary, T.P.F., 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.

Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 3s. 0d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard.

MAY



1922

PSYCHOLOGY AND INDUSTRY.

For the last few years there has been a boom in psychology. Most bookshops exhibit ponderous volumes dealing with this particular subject. Booksellers' lists advertise numerous books setting forth conflicting theories.

As a general rule, when there is a boom in the scientific or pseudo scientific world in any particular subject, a close examination of the matter will disclose some important material interest lying at the back of the boom; or some material interest that is served by assisting to boom whatever matter is in question.

To this general rule psychology is no exception.

A short time ago a little book was published by Methuen & Co., Ltd., entitled "Present-Day Applications of Psychology, with special reference to Industry, Education, and Nervous Breakdown," by Charles S. Myers, M.A., M.D., Sc.D., F.R.S., Director of the Psychological Laboratory, Cambridge.

The author defines Psychology as the scientific study of the human and animal mind. He advocates the appointment of trained Psychologists in all branches of industry as a profitable proposition from a commercial point of view. In order to illustrate how valuable such a proposition would

be to employers he gives a description of certain experiments that have been made.

One such experiment he describes as follows—with reference to the principle of the number of contractions that could be carried out in lifting weights before exhaustion ensues:—

"This principle has been applied practically in the case of 500 shovellers who were being employed in shovelling, with a shovel of constant size, material of very varying weight—sometimes coal, sometimes ashes, at other times heavy iron ore, etc., etc. Experiments were conducted with shovels of different sizes in order to ascertain the optimal weight per shovel load of a good shoveller. The best average weight was found to be 21 lbs. Accordingly, shovels were made of different sizes, in proportion to the heaviness of the material shovelled, so that each shovel whether full of coal, ash or iron, etc., weighed 21 lbs. This was the most important innovation, although others were at the same time carried out. The results were as follows:—(i) the average amount shovelled per day rose by nearly 270 per cent—from 16 to 59 tons per man; (ii) 150 men could now perform what 500 men had performed under previous conditions; (iii) the average earnings of the shovellers increased by 60 per cent.; (iv) the cost of the management, after paying all extra expenses, was reduced by 50 per cent.; (v) there was no evidence of increased fatigue of the shovellers." (Page 9—italics ours.)

From the above it will be seen that by applying the results of scientific psychology in this particular case the gain to the capitalist would be 270 per cent. in the amount shovelled, whilst the increase in shovellers' earnings was only 60 per cent., i.e., a nett gain to the capitalist of 210 per cent. Of course, experience tells us that the workers in question would not be long in receipt of the 60 per cent. increase. There is little doubt that in such a case a revision of piece-work rates would soon occur.

On top of the nett gain of 210 per cent. there is a further advantage to the capitalist of 50 per cent. decrease in the cost of management.

The following quotation from the "Daily News" (11/3/22) gives an illustration of the application of scientific psychology in another branch of industry. The quotation refers to the activity of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology:—

"Dr. C. S. Myers, the director of the institute, who stated that he had resigned the chair of psychology at Cambridge University to devote himself to the work of the institute, said that during the year investigators had examined into the methods of packing chocolates for Messrs. J. Lyons & Co. By favouring rhythmical movements and abolishing unnecessary ones, an average increase

of output amounting to 35 per cent. had been obtained." (Italics ours.)

Here again we have the same point illustrated—a gain to the employers.

According to the above two quotations it will be seen that the nett result obtained by the application of scientific psychology to industry may be stated as follows: A larger amount of surplus value will be obtained by the capitalist and there will be less employment to be obtained by the workers. This will be due to the more economical handling of the means of wealth production.

One main point is forced to our notice here. The application of science to industry under capitalism has two general effects: it increases the productiveness of a given quantity of human labour power, thereby increasing the profits of the capitalists, and at the same time increasing the unemployment and consequent misery of the workers.

How topsy-turvy, then, is a system of society in which the valuable productive methods provided by scientific research are of necessity converted into a source of profit for the few and a source of misery for the mass of the population?

The only way to avoid such an anomaly is to substitute for the present form of society another form in which all the means and methods that science can discover to aid in the production of wealth and lessen the toil of the producers will be welcomed by the whole of society as means to obtain increased leisure and enjoyment.

SOCIALISM, "MATTER" AND GHOSTS.

The Editors, SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Dear Sirs,

I regret that Mr. Sala should be under the impression that I think he is an uninformed person. I am quite sure that, where Socialism is concerned, he is not so.

I did think the articles to which I referred in my letter in the "S.S." of February unnecessary, because the ordinary working-man is not distracted from pondering on his economic condition by philosophy or psychical research, nor do these subjects "bluff" him. To him, they are but faint and far-off voices. It would be more to the purpose to attack football, racing, cinemas and beer.

However, if you are going to give us, occasionally, articles on the subjects in

question, for heaven's sake give us something better than piffle. I agree with Mr. Sala that these matters should not be outside our interests.

In the December "S.S." Mr. Sala seemed very cocksure about "matter." My simple questions have dissipated his dogmatism. He now recognises that "matter" *per se* is unthinkable. ("S.S.," February.) I agree. It is merely "a point of view." As Bergson says, "A frozen snapshot of mobility."

I am disappointed that Mr. Sala fights shy of my second question. The fact is, we can think of force alone as the cause of our sensations. Dead, inactive "matter" or "substance," if there were such, we could never, by any possibility, know; since, by the definition, it could never act upon us, and produce sensation. That which acts, of course, is force. We are compelled to think that sensation is evoked by efficient power, which is not still and inert, but is forceful, active and alive. Apart from sensation, thus produced, we have no knowledge of the universe whatsoever.

Berkeley calls this power which effects sensation in us, Spirit; Schopenhauer calls it Will; Spencer calls it Force. But it is manifest to a student of philosophy that these thinkers are referring to one and the same reality—a reality totally different from the naive, self-contradictory, common-sense illusion of "material substance."

The author of "Ghosts" is, clearly, uninformed on the subject upon which he has the temerity to write. To refer to the findings of men trained in the scientific method as "senility" does not reveal the honest scrutiniser of facts.

Yours fraternally,

GEO. T. FOSTER.

REPLY.

Comrades,

I will deal with Mr. Foster's last point first.

Although, personally, I fully endorse all that the author of "Ghosts" says in his article, yet, as its authorship does not concern me, I can only refer to Mr. Foster's criticism of what appears over my own name.

There are quite a lot of people who think our articles are unnecessary; in fact would like to see them suppressed altogether, for the simple reason that we tell the truth in too straight a fashion. We prostitute

neither our pens nor our intellects. What we have to say is based on a scientific foundation, and is solely in the interests of the working class. It may be true—I hope it is—that “the ordinary (!) working man is not distracted from his economic condition by philosophy or psychical research.” He would be distracted indeed were he to meddle with this stuff. Mr. Foster’s observation that these subjects do not bluff the workers is superfluous. I never said they did. The notion is absurd. But that individuals in the name of Science do bluff the workers needs no proving: it is apparent to any intelligent observer. An instance was the one quoted in the December issue, where the existence of a “Creator” and a “Soul” were implied in a publication claiming to embody the latest scientific discoveries and which was intended for the consumption of the general public.

As sensation is only produced by material objects, and as the terms “God” and “Soul” appear, when tested by the light of science, to be outside the domain of human knowledge, my intellect cannot apprehend them. In my humble way I believed that before we could even think there must be some material to be thought of, that thought itself was a mode of material activity. Mr. Foster calls it being “cocksure” and wants something better than this “piffle.” He states that his “simple” questions have dissipated my dogmatism. If so, he has succeeded in dissipating something which wasn’t there. My criticism was essentially scientific. Science and dogma are incompatible; there is no dogmatic science.

I certainly said that matter *per se* was unthinkable. So it is. One cannot conceive of matter apart from energy. But Mr. Foster’s statement that I “now” recognise this implies that I didn’t know it before. He assumes too much.

It is reported that, according to experiments made by Sir Wm. Ramsay, energy has been transformed into matter, but it is quite positive that without the assistance of material agencies the experiment could not have been made under artificial conditions. Present-day Physics require us to dismiss “matter” in its *ultimate* sense as an obsolete hypothesis, and to replace it by “energy” with its capacity for entering into various combinations.

But what does it mean? Simply this: that what we call “matter” is built up of electrical charges containing vast stores of energy, so that it might appear that matter and energy are really one and the same thing. Reduced to terms of electricity, the question remains—What is electricity? So far science does not profess to know. But Mr. Foster does—it is “merely a point of view”!

Having disposed of matter in this way, he goes on to say that force *alone* is the cause of our sensations. If by “force” Mr. Foster meant “energy,” then I would be with him in his conception of how sensation is evoked. But he appears to rule both matter and energy out altogether. That is why I “fought shy” of his question. As it stood it was simply unintelligible to me. As I pointed out in my last letter, “force” has no physical existence. Apart from that, I may be permitted to point out that we of the Socialist Party fight shy of no proposition or criticism, whether coming from Mr. Foster or anyone else; the only condition being that it is in an understandable form.

For ordinary convenience scientists are obliged to use the term “matter” whatever its “ultimate” nature may be. But Mr. Foster believes there is a “reality” somewhere beyond this: something totally different to the “common-sense illusion of material substance.” If there is something else which is neither matter nor energy and yet is reality, it wants proving. I am afraid that if I, in my present capacity as Extension Lecturer in Geology, were to tell my audiences that the “matter” I was attempting to describe had no real existence, but that what did exist was some indefinable something, totally unrelated to the material substance they only imagined they were conscious of, I should be chased off the premises.

To sum the matter up, what do Mr. Foster’s statements amount to?

Matter has no existence—to say it exists is to be dogmatic. The paper upon which I am writing does not exist—it is purely imagination. What *does* exist is “reality”—but a different reality to the reality which we call matter and which is made apparent to our senses by energy. Berkeley called it Spirit; Schopenhauer called it Will; Spencer called it Force; Mr. Foster calls it Reality; some call it God. But it really

doesn’t matter: they all mean the same thing!

To me it appears to be a difference in the methods employed in the interpretation of phenomena—on the one hand the scientific, on the other the one employed by students of bourgeois philosophy.

Under capitalism, the majority of men do not derive their opinions from scientific truth; scientific truth itself is often distorted to accommodate men’s opinions. This truckling to ignorance, to which scientists almost without exception lend themselves, reveals their dependence on the vagaries of the ruling class, who are their paymasters; and who, in the last resort, determine what views shall, or shall not, be propagated. At the present time a Bill is before the legislature of Kentucky forbidding the use in schools of text books in which the doctrine of evolution is taught. Under a scientific system of society this would not happen. It is precisely that for which we are working. The present system is completely reactionary so far as the welfare of the majority of mankind is concerned.

They are steeped in ignorance, we know, and it is intended by those in power to keep them there. So far only the Socialists have undertaken the task of enlightening them on their true position in the universe. Those “faint and far off voices” shall be brought nearer, so that the much maligned proletariat can examine their meaning. What there is in science they will, before very long, appropriate, providing it coincides with their interests. There is sufficient already to guide the Socialist on his course of redeeming mankind from the misery and slavery in which it has toiled and existed to this day. It is to a system of freedom based upon the scientific principles enunciated by Karl Marx that we look forward, rather than the “never-ending, eternal weight of glory” of Sir Oliver Lodge. This will be accomplished, not on the lines suggested by Mr. Foster of attacking the evils of a system, but the more scientific method of removing the causes.

I have treated this at some length in order to show Mr. Foster, and others like him, that, as scientific Socialists, we have no use for their metaphysical nonsense, and that, although members of the “ordinary” working class, we are not the “duds” they think we are.

Yours fraternally,

TOM SALA.

CAPITALISM AND CRIME.

If we as workers make a critical analysis of capitalist society, we find that it does not appear to contain many redeeming features. The class in whose interests the present system of society is maintained, care little who is crushed and become its victims, so long as the development assures to them profits and the security of their position as a ruling class.

The fundamental feature of modern society is the private property basis, production and distribution of wealth for profit, and the maintenance of that position by the resort to force.

We have stated that society is based upon private property, *i.e.*, the private ownership of land, raw materials, machinery of production and distribution, by and in the interests of a relatively few people.

The overwhelming majority of the people of each capitalist country are divorced from their means of livelihood, or, in other words, cannot claim a right to the food, clothing, and shelter necessary to sustain life. Although food and clothing exist in abundance, capitalist papers record almost daily either people dying of starvation or millions just obtaining a bare subsistence.

When wealth has been produced in such huge quantities that it chokes the markets of the world, we have the vast majority of the workers suffering most acutely at the very time they should be enjoying life to the full. Even if workers are successful in obtaining employment, the wages they receive in exchange for the expenditure of their labour power is only just sufficient on an average to sustain life and generate enough energy to go on working if profitable to their masters.

The housing accommodation is of the worst, millions existing in wretched hovels or in one or two-roomed tenements. The food they obtain for themselves and dependants is of the poorest, often adulterated to such an extent that it is almost unfit for human consumption. The clothes and boots are usually of the shabbiest and shoddiest kind.

In fact, many thousands of workers go through life, even when in employment, and are never “lucky” enough to put a new suit upon their backs or new boots upon their feet.

But if that can be said with truth of those

employed, what must be the experience of those more frequently unemployed than employed?

Obviously, their conditions must on the whole consist of a far more bitter struggle for existence. If those able-bodied men and women are ready, willing, and prepared to expend their quota of energy in producing the world's wealth for the sustenance and comfort of the human race, and the capitalist class refuse them the opportunity of so doing, then can it be wondered at that many of them are driven to crime?

These victims of capitalist society resort to countless ways to obtain the wherewithal to live.

The vast majority seemingly resign themselves to their wretched existence, easily fall a victim of apathy and despair, usually awaiting death as the only way out of their troubles and anxieties.

But an ever-increasing number, many of whom are exceptionally intelligent men and women, prefer to commit offences against the laws of private property and so to obtain a modicum of comfort or even to live in luxury on a lavish scale. Almost daily we see reported in the Press accounts of daring coups and great robberies running into thousands of pounds of wealth; likewise countless numbers of petty thefts from working-class houses, shops, docks, and railway sidings, etc. It requires but little intelligence for any discerning and enquiring person to see that crimes are the outcome of the ever-worsening struggle for existence.

The latter statement is amply borne out by the following quotations from the "Evening News" (14/2/22).

"Falling prices, the prolonged stagnation of trade, and the money tightness are responsible for the ever-increasing number of fake burglaries and fake fires in London: and the insurance companies are having a by no means happy time."

Writing of the assessors engaged by insurance companies, they say:—

"Theirs is a different profession now-a-days, for assessors are finding that each year thieves are becoming more ingenious and more scientific. The old type of cracksman is fast disappearing, and the new type is a subtle-minded Raffles rather than primitive Bill Sikes. Among them are ex-officers and educated men who have given up the search for work in favour of an exciting and remunerative life, whereby three or four jobs a year provide them with an excellent income. They dress well, frequent the best hotels and restaurants, often mix in good society, and remain unsuspected by the police unless their crimes are exceptional enough

to attract investigations by Scotland Yard's Special Branch." (Italics mine.)

The capitalist system produces the "criminals" as it produces other social features. If men cannot obtain employment and therefore obtain a means of subsistence, what alternative is there for them but to beg, borrow, or steal, or in the last resort commit suicide? Even in the latter instance if the individual fails to accomplish the desired end—extinction of life—he is hauled before a defender of private property and punished.

The system produces its own "criminals" and then proceeds to punish them. There are generally more workers in the market than actually required by the employers. This fact alone is sufficient evidence that unemployment will continue. With the wonderful improvements in machinery, and scientific applications to industry, the tendency will be in the direction of rendering more and more workers superfluous; this will probably bring a further increase in "crime" against the laws of property. Every year competition in the world of finance and industry becomes more keen, crises occur more rapidly, and bankruptcies stare in the face large numbers of one-time well-established businesses. Just recently in the financial world two very large firms closed their doors, and practically the whole of the staff are cut off for the time from the means of obtaining their livelihood.

A newspaper reporter appeared at the offices of the firms to obtain information of the crash, and he reports as follows:—

"The staff at the City Equitable numbers about 80, and they are still at work at the office. But it was said to-day that all but 6 or 7 would have to be dismissed in a week or two."

At the offices of the other firm only one of the staff was left, and he was alleged to have made the following statement:—

"Many of us had entrusted our savings to the firm, and all of them have gone in the crash. It will be a hard time for us, especially the middle-aged men who have been here for so many years. There seems to be little prospect of our finding other employment." *Evening News*, 17/2/22.

Here is an instance of modern society being responsible for the production of its potential "criminals." If there is little prospect of them obtaining other employment, what can they do to obtain food, clothing, and shelter in the future for themselves and families?

But capitalism allows but little room for

excuses from its victims. If they do not obtain their sustenance by legal means, then they must pay the penalty. Even the most trivial offence against the law is sufficient for the watchdogs of law and order to lay their hands on the offender, as the following will serve to show:—

"Found snaring chaffinches, an ex-service man was charged to-day at Tottenham with cruelty and was fined £5. 'I was out of work,' he said, 'and was chancing my arm.'" (Italics mine.) *Evening News*, 16/2/22.

On numerous occasions cases have been reported in the Press of proceedings in the police courts against individuals charged with manslaughter, robbery with violence, and murder. It is seldom urged on behalf of the police by counsel conducting the case that the prisoner has destroyed human life or inflicted grievous injury merely as a lust for blood or wanton destruction. As a rule, lurking in the background are the ugly facts of poverty or starvation.

The writer commenced this article by saying that capitalism could hardly claim one solitary redeeming feature. And so he will conclude it. Rack your brain as you will, almost every social evil and disease you can name arises out of and through the maintenance of a system of society wherein the wealth producers, i.e., the working class, are robbed of the wealth they alone produce.

With Socialism established, it will be in the interests of ALL to see that every able-bodied man and woman contributed their quota of energy necessary for production of wealth, and so lighten the task and make possible a happy, contented race of people.

THE SETTLER.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE

S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1

DIGHT'S DILEMMA.

To the Editors, SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Dear Sirs,

On page 104 of the SOCIALIST STANDARD of this month's issue you quote from Marx's "Critique of Political Economy," as follows:—

"No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions for their existence have matured in the womb of the old society."

And then, for the purpose of emphasising the above quotation, you quote again, this time from the "oft-quoted passage" (so gleefully and gloatingly quoted so often by yourselves since the November Revolution in Russia) from the preface to Marx's "Capital":—

"One nation can and should learn from others. And even when a society has got upon the right track for the discovery of the natural laws of its movement—and it is the ultimate aim of this work to lay bare the economic law of motion of modern society—it can neither clear by bold leaps, nor remove by legal enactments, the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development. But it can shorten and lessen the birth pangs." (Italics mine.)

And this is your interpretation as instanced by your comment which follows immediately upon the quotations:—

"These quotations prove not only that Marx did not expect a country in a backward condition economically to be able to establish Socialism, but also that he expressly denied such a thing possible. So far from following Marx as 'Judex' suggests, Lenin has acted in direct opposition to Marx's teaching. To suggest that, a country like Russia, still largely feudalistic, with only the beginnings of capitalism, is 'most suitable for Socialism,' shows a most complete ignorance of Marx, coupled with a boundless recklessness of assertion."

Far from wanting to defend "Judex," of the "English Review," I am nevertheless opposed to the possible inference that can be drawn from the above, that Lenin, as well as "Judex," displays "ignorance of Marx, coupled with a boundless recklessness of assertion," as well as your "reckless assertion" that "Lenin has acted in direct opposition to Marx's teaching." Marx, of course, "did not expect a country in a backward condition economically to establish Socialism." But did Lenin? Again and again did Lenin assert the necessity for the economic development of Russia as being requisite for the establishment of Socialism. But if you wish to imply that

that means that Russia must first of all pass through all the phases of capitalist development, then how do you account for, say, America (among other countries) not having passed through feudalism as well as others that have not passed through all its phases? Marx, when referring to a society being on "the right track for the discovery of the natural laws of its movement," clearly refers to a *revolutionary* period within that society. Hence his reference to the "birth pangs." And then if we read that this revolutionary period cannot be cleared "by bold leaps," nor that "the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development" can be removed "by legal enactments," we shall then be able to reconcile your quotations with the following:—

"Let us now look at Russia. At the time of the Revolution of 1848—1849, the monarchs of Europe, like the European bourgeoisie, saw in Russian intervention their sole means of protection against the proletariat, at that time just awakening to a consciousness of its strength. They placed the Czar at the head of European reaction. To-day, he is a prisoner of revolution at Gatchina, and Russia is in the front rank of the revolutionary movement of Europe. The burden of the Communist manifesto was the declaration of the inevitable disappearance of existing bourgeois property. But in Russia, along with the capitalist system which is developing with feverish haste, and of the large landed property of the bourgeoisie in course of formation, more than half of the land is the common property of the peasantry. The question is, therefore, whether the Russian peasant commune, that already degenerate form of primitive commune property in land, will pass directly into the superior form of communist ownership of the land, or whether it must rather first follow the same process of dissolution that it has undergone in the historical development of the West? The only possible way to reply to that question to-day is as follows: *If the Russian Revolution is the signal for a workers' revolution in the West, and if both should be successful, then the existing communal property of Russia may serve as the starting point for a communist development.*" (Preface to 2nd Russian edition of Communist Manifesto written by Marx and Engels, 1882. Italics mine.)

If my reading and interpretation (which opposes yours) of your quotations is incorrect, how do you reconcile your quotations with mine? It seems to me you've got some job.

Yours faithfully,

HY. DIGHT.

REPLY—

Mr. Dight's method of discussing Marx in relation to Russia is so delightfully simple as to almost cause one to wonder if it is genuine. If we will only suppose that

Marx meant something quite contrary to what he wrote, then it will be easy to follow Mr. Dight. But if one decides to keep closely to what Marx wrote and taught, then Mr. Dight is hopelessly out of the argument.

Mr. Dight's "possible inference" only becomes so by straining language beyond all reason. The very quotation, "most suitable for Socialism," shows that it was "Judex" who showed a "most complete ignorance of Marx, coupled with a boundless recklessness." Lenin is not ignorant of Marx. But this only makes matters worse for Lenin.

Mr. Dight says: "Marx, of course, did not expect a country in a backward condition economically to establish Socialism." But did Lenin? The answer is Yes! Lenin proclaimed the upheaval in 1917 as a "Socialist Revolution" even as late as his "Left Wing Communism," written in 1920. It is true that later Lenin had to modify his own words, as he has had to do on so many other points. But that hits Lenin and Dight—not us.

Almost any elementary school child could answer the question about America. That country was colonised by people who had already reached the early stages of capitalism, and is an example of capitalist development by transplanted material. It is not a case of a nation passing over to capitalism without going through Feudalism, as the *natives* did not develop at all—perhaps because they were exterminated by the newcomers.

It is in his next sentence that Mr. Dight tries to saddle us with the simple assumption referred to above when, in dealing with the quotation from "Capital," he says: "Marx . . . clearly refers to a *revolutionary* period, etc." Marx, on the contrary, "clearly" does nothing of the sort. He was dealing with the "normal development" of societies and how they cannot evade the "successive phases" of this "normal development."

But even if one takes Mr. Dight's absurd assumption, for the purpose of the argument, Mr. Dight's conclusion is still false. When Marx writes of "revolutionary periods" he takes care to explain that he is dealing with "social revolutions," where one system is broken up and another takes its place. No such "revolution" has taken place in Russia. Due to the war and the

corruption it developed among the ruling class, Czarism collapsed, and in the chaos following, the Bolsheviks—a tiny minority—after a first failure, seized power in 1917. No fundamental change took place in the methods of producing and distributing wealth. In other words, there was no "social revolution." All that happened was that one minority began to rule instead of another. The attempts of this minority to impose economic methods and conditions upon a people not yet developed to a level of these conditions has been without success. That is to say, that they have failed disastrously to "clear by bold leaps or remove by legal enactments" (though the latter have been turned out by the ton) "the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development." To any normal person the facts of the situation in Russia would be a complete and crushing answer to Dight. Not so to the short-sighted and intellectually limited fanatic. Calmly ignoring the situation, he tries to find comfort in idiotic interpretations of Marx's writings.

As Mr. Dight's first point falls, his second—dealing with the 1882 preface to the "Communist Manifesto"—no longer holds. But even apart from this, the quotation itself is a flat contradiction to the position of Mr. Dight. Take the very sentence he has put into italics because he thinks it gives us "some job." (It does—to avoid choking with laughter at his blindness.) The sentence contains three points, each of which is in direct opposition to the position in Russia:—

"If the Russian Revolution is the signal for a workers' revolution in the West . . . (Italics ours.)"

As the upheaval in Russia in 1917 scarcely raised a ripple among the "workers of the West," and certainly not the faintest suggestion of a Revolution, this point by itself smashes Dight's attempted case. At the Berlin Conference of the three "Internationals" Radek made a statement showing how correct our attitude is. He said in reference to the Soviet Republic "which no one denies is, if not a workers', at least a revolutionary state ('Communist,' 15/4/1922). As he admits it was not a workers' "revolution," it would be interesting to know *whose* "revolution" he considers it to be!

The second point is:—

"and if both should be successful, etc.,"

As neither came into existence, Mr. Dight cannot draw even the pretence of support from this phrase.

"then the existing communal property of Russia may serve as the starting point for a Communist development."

Even in the conclusion, nothing positive. Marx and Engels do not say that it "will" be a starting point, but only that it "may." Two "ifs" and a "may" in the sentence—with the "ifs" not yet fulfilled! And this is the sort of stuff Dight relies upon when he tries to falsify the teachings of Marx. But the matter may be taken a point further.

The great blunder made by Lenin and Trotsky was that they, in their ignorance of Western conditions, expected a revolution by the workers of England, Germany, and France. Even after their first disappointment, when they had to sign the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, they still hoped for this Western Revolution. Only now are they beginning to realise the hopelessness of such an event for some time ahead. Hence their concessions and offers to the European and American capitalists.

A great deal of injury has been done to the propaganda of Socialism by attempting to foist upon Marx the responsibility for the wild-headed schemes of the Bolsheviks and their supporters. The blind praise of anything emanating from Russia has led these fanatics to actions injurious to the Bolsheviks themselves. Instead of recognising the overpowering conditions against the Bolsheviks and giving them praise for certain things they have *done*, these ranters have devoted their whole attention to boosting the absurd *claims* of the Bolsheviks. Fantastic decrees that had not the slightest effect outside of the office issuing them, were hailed as marvels produced by geniuses, that changed Russia overnight from a private property basis to one of advanced Communism. Millions of peasants who could not read were converted, we were told, into class-conscious, highly intelligent Marxians by the shoals of pamphlets distributed among them! Only its tremendous tragedy saves it from being a farce.

And all the time, as we have continually pointed out in the pages of the SOCIALIST STANDARD, the Bolsheviks were doing things that deserved high praise and which, put in their proper perspective, gave valuable

lessons to the Western workers. The first lesson they gave was to show that a minority, who were *not* capitalists, could run the affairs of a huge country, under the special conditions existing there, in an efficient manner. This lesson tends to break down the superstition still held by many workers, "that you must have the capitalists in control," and has aroused shrieking opposition from the Churchills and Poincarés of the West.

One of the Departments whose efficiency has been most loudly advertised by the supporters of Bolshevism is the War Department, whose head, Trotsky, has appropriated most of the praise to himself. But, as a matter of fact, Trotsky's work—assuming it *was* his—was far less difficult than that of every other Department. After being under Conscription for generations, the Russian peasant falls almost automatically into the position of a soldier if he is supplied with munitions. It was a task of immensely greater magnitude to manufacture a rifle in Russia than to use it once it was made. The difficulties of transport were colossal, and under the conditions prevailing the Transport Department worked in a marvellous manner. The question of obtaining food for the townspeople, and the paralysing problem of how to transport such food as existed in face of the Army's demand for railways and wagons, was sufficient to appal the strongest. In education, too, the attempt to adopt the best of Western methods, and the care given to the children will stand like a monument to the credit of those responsible for the Department.

It is for things of this kind that the Bolsheviks deserve high praise—not for ignoring the teachings of Marx. And even here the Marxian dictum receives marked illustration. What was the first obstacle the Bolsheviks met? The answer is, "Lack of sufficient men and women capable of carrying on the work." With all the good-will in the world, they were too few in numbers to "man" all the Departments themselves, and there was a lamentable shortage of others, capable of doing so, in the country. Practically every visitor to Russia, even if a bitter opponent of the Bolsheviks, agrees that the latter have been "bled white" under the terrific strain imposed upon them by the attempt to administer so huge a country.

J. F.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 214. Vol. 18.]

LONDON, JUNE, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

AMERICA—THE LAND OF BOMBAST AND POVERTY

A Review of "Men and Steel," by Mary Heaton Vorse—published by The Labour Publishing Co., 6, Tavistock Square, W.C. 1. Price 3s. 6d.

This is a book of 185 pages dealing principally with the American Steel Strike of 1918-1919. It is written in a rather rhetorical style, and, apparently, is the work of a visitor—a visitor whose emotions were stirred by the poverty and oppression she witnessed—who went to various districts and recorded impressions received, conversations, odd statements at meetings and descriptions of places visited and people seen. While a good deal of information is given as to housing conditions in the steel towns, and oppressive actions during the strike, there is little information as to the working conditions prevailing in the steel works. At the same time there is a good deal of useful information contained in the book.

On page 17 we are told:—

"About one-half of the steel industry is owned by the U.S. Steel Corporation. These are the figures of the Corporation's surplus:—

" 1913 Total undivided surplus ...	\$151,798,428.89
" 1914 " " " " ...	135,204,471.90
" 1915 " " " " ...	180,025,328.74
" 1916 " " " " ...	381,360,913.37
" 1917 " " " " ...	431,660,803.63
" 1918 " " " " ...	466,888,421.38
" 1919 " " " " ...	493,048,201.93

"Interchurch Report of Steel Strike."

The "Total undivided surplus" signifies the surplus after paying dividends and setting aside large sums for other purposes. For example, according to a further quotation by the author from the Interchurch Report (same page), it appears that in 1918 the above corporation paid over 96 million

dollars in dividends, set aside over 174 millions for Federal taxes due in 1919, and still had an undivided surplus of nearly 500 million dollars!

It will be observed that the *undivided* surplus has risen by over 200 per cent. in six years!

When, along with the above figures, we recollect the enormous amount of watered capital usually introduced into the actually paid up capital of such corporations as the above, we can obtain a faint idea of the staggering amount of surplus value robbed from the American steel workers by the steel magnates.

On page 26 we learn:—

"The United States Steel Corporation's policy as regard labour dominates the steel industry.

"There are, roughly speaking, 500,000 steel workers in the United States.

"191,000 employees work in U.S. Steel Corporation's manufacturing plants.

"32 per cent. do not make enough pay to come to the level set by Government experts as minimum subsistence standard for family of five.

"72 per cent. of all steel workers are below the level set by Government experts as minimum of comfort level set for families of five. That means that three-quarters of the steel workers cannot earn enough for an American standard of living.

"50 per cent. of the U.S. Steel Corporation's employees work 12 hours a day. 50 per cent. of these work 7 days a week.

"Steel workers work from 20 to 40 hours longer a week than other basic industries near steel communities.

"American steel workers work over 20 hours a week longer than British steel workers."*

*"Interchurch Report of Steel Strike."

Twelve hours a day, seven days a week, for less than the minimum subsistence standard for a family of five! And the steel

workers, according to the author, are in the habit of having large families. It is a pity the author does not state the nature of "the level set by Government experts as minimum of comfort level set for families of five."

Such are wages and hours in the land of "hustle"—the country to which the sweated slaves of Europe turn hopeful eyes, under the delusion that there they will be able to find the comfort and security denied them in their present surroundings. Many buoyed up by this hope have scraped together what enabled them to reach the hopeful West?—only to find disillusionment in such places as the steel towns. Experience is bitterly teaching the workers that the ugly head of capitalism is reared in practically every land under the sun.

The author of the book under review gives various descriptions of the Steel Towns. One such description is as follows:—

"The mills of this town were on the flat river bottom. The old river banks mount steeply. The yards of the rickety frame houses slope sharply down. Melting snow had uncovered the refuse of winter. In the air was the sickly sweet smell of rotting garbage. The steep yards were surrounded by ramshackle fences. At the bottom near the street heavier things had slipped down hill—discarded bed springs, coal scuttles with holes in them, rusty pots and pans, old corsets, shoes, and more tin cans. In these towns on the Monongahela refuse and garbage are not taken away. For months it rots where it lies. Spring finds it there." Page 27.

Here is another description, this time of the steelworkers' dwelling places in Braddock:—

"They live some in two-storey brick houses, some in blackened frame dwellings. One set of houses faces the street, the other the court. The courts are bricked and littered with piles of cans, piles of rubbish, bins of garbage, hillocks of refuse—refuse and litter, litter and refuse. Playing in the refuse and ashes and litter—children. The decencies of life ebb away as one nears the mills. I passed one day along an alley which fronted on an empty lot. Here the filth and refuse of years had been churned into viscous mud. A lean dog was digging. Pale children paddled in the squashy filth, and made playthings of ancient rubbish. Beyond was the railway tracks, beyond that the mills. Two-storied brick houses flanked the brick street. No green thing grew anywhere." Page 33.

Such are the districts occupied by the workers, in filthy courtyards without running water, without conveniences. As the author points out these are the only places they can occupy.

"If a man is working in the Edgar Thompson Works, he must live in Braddock; if he is work-

ing for the Carnegie Steel Co. in Homestead, he must live in Homestead. If you look around and try to hire a better place, you will find there is none."

Many of the people who live in these "salubrious" surroundings have come from European villages. They went to America with high hopes, but their hopes and their health were smothered in the smoke and filth of the steel towns.

The power of capital over the lives of the workers is illustrated in a multitude of ways. The following quotation will give an idea of how the much vaunted "democracy" of America works in actual practice:—

"The men who own the steel mills and the mines and the railways that brought the steel ore down to the water-front and the boats that carried it across the lake, own other things in Alleghany County. They control the law courts. The mounted state police are at their call. The political power—with all burgesses and sheriffs—they own also. In the steel country government is possessed nakedly by those iron and steel masters and their friends." Page 49.

In September, 1918, the steel workers struck. Now we have often been told of the way the Americans "get a move on things," but an examination of the strike demands show that this evidently does not apply to the American workers. The demands illustrate a condition similar to what was general in England before the Factory Acts. The plentiful supply of emigrants to the "New World" kept flesh and blood relatively cheaper in America. It is only in the last twenty years that the American Capitalists learnt how much new men cost; the expensiveness of the shifting and ebbing of labour; the poorness, from a productive point of view, of a discontented and disaffected labour supply. Previously, in the tear and rush and scramble for wealth, they took no note of these things, but experience has at length forced this knowledge upon them, and so they have spent millions of dollars on welfare work.

The demands put forward by the striking steel workers were as follows:—

- "(1) Right of collective bargaining.
- "(2) Reinstatement of all men discharged for union activities with pay for time lost.
- "(3) Eight hour day.
- "(4) One day's rest in seven.
- "(5) Abolition of 24-hour shift.
- "(6) Increases in wages sufficient to guarantee American standard of living.

(7) Standard scales of wages in all trades and classification of workers.

"(8) Double rates of pay for all overtime after eight hours, holiday, and Sunday work.

"(9) Check-off system of collecting union dues.

"(10) Principles of seniority to apply in the maintenance, reduction, and increase of working forces.

"(11) Abolition of company unions.

"(12) Abolition of physical examination of applicants for employment." Page 50.

Further comment on these demands is hardly needed, they speak for themselves, particularly 1, 4, 5, 6, 11 and 12.

Three hundred thousand steel workers came out on strike. Their organisation was poor; the companies controlled all news and the only means the workers had of finding out how things were going on in other districts was by the receipt of an occasional strike bulletin or, still less frequent, the visit of an organiser. Strike meetings were generally prohibited, strikers and sympathisers victimised. The constabulary was given a free hand and thousands of strikers were battered and thousands spirited away to prison to await a charge which was never preferred. The espionage system was in swing.

According to the Author the strike was killed by silence, by violence, and by the ultimate defection of one of the American skilled workers' unions. The latter point is one upon which we have not sufficient information to form a judgment. Terrorist groups, under the name of citizens' committees, also played their part in assisting to smash the strike.

Unfortunately the Author's style prevents her from setting forth the facts of the situation in such a way as to enable us to form an accurate judgment of the immediate cause of the strike, its possibilities of success, and the reason for such a complete collapse in face of such solidarity at its commencement.

Of the strikers the Author writes:—

"They were without strike discipline, they were without strike benefits; they were communities where no strike meetings were allowed to be held, some of the men never heard a speaker in their own language during all the strike." Page 58.

Of the activities of the masters we learn:—

"When the men struck violence by the police increased. The Constabulary had already become active. Now the state troopers appeared in all the steel towns. They broke up meetings. They rode their horses into the workers' very houses. In Braddock no assemblies of peoples were permitted.

They rode down men coming from mass. Steel workers could not assemble. They chased the children of Father Kazinci's parish school."

* * * * *

"The idea seemed to be to terrorise the workers. There were besides deputised gunmen. Workers were arrested by the hundreds, held, and no charges preferred against them. Then they were fined." Page 63.

"The stories of beatings and arrests came in an endless flood. There was no end to them. Within two days one was drenched with them. In three days one was saturated. They made no more impression. They became part of life." Page 67.

We think we have now given a fair sample of the contents of the book under review. There are many tales of the patience and self-sacrifice of the strikers, but we have already overburdened this review with quotations.

To those who agree with "the right of the employer to do what he likes with his own," it will give some staggering information. Generally speaking it is worth reading to obtain an idea of some of the methods used by the employing class of America against the working class of that country. It might help to remove the clouds from the minds of those who exalt "Republican America" over "Monarchical England," and help to teach them that where capital goes, whether to Republic or Monarchy, there goes also its shadow—slavery and misery.

GILMAC.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc. ::

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE

S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C 1

LIGHT ON COMMUNIST POLICY.

It is with a certain interest, not to say unfeigned delight, that I learn from Max Eastman (*Liberator*, April, 1922), that E. T. Whitehead, of the Communist Party of Great Britain, is "inclined to believe" that in the last few years "an unusual number of other-regarding spirits have been thrown down into the physical sphere" from some haunt of the disembodied! He believes this because it is "more likely to be true than not." This credulity perhaps explains Whitehead's little vagaries.

Max Eastman facetiously suggests that the American Communists "solve their problem of perfection by organising a party on the astral plane to control the one which now controls the visible manifestation." I should be sorry to rob Max Eastman of the credit due to the originator of so charming an idea, but I fear he is too late. It has already been done here. I have tried hard to keep up with and understand the erratic moves in Communist policy, never realising until now that I was following a will-o'-the-wisp, not the product of gross human minds, but of ghostly Third International "pixey wixies."

For alas, even out of the physical sphere conflict reigns. There are other sources of Communist inspiration; for instance, the much older firm established long before Theosophy raised its upstart head. In the *Evening News* (27th March, 1922) I read that "at a confirmation service last evening at St. John's Church, . . . over 40 Socialists and Communists, members of the Church of England, were confirmed by the Bishop of Whalley." I can't vouch for the accuracy of this report, but like Whitehead "I am inclined to believe it" about members of the Communist party because "it is more likely to be true than not." A writer in the *Communist* recently waxed merry over the untutored person who described them as "communionsists." On second thoughts I think the apparently ignorant one must have known something.

A correspondent of the *Daily Herald* (31st Dec., 1921) relates how the South Shields Branch of the Communist Party had "a clay bust of Lloyd George with horns" before which apparently they discussed business.

Here are a few other things to be

accounted for only by the hypothesis I have accepted. At the Communist Party's recent policy conference a resolution was introduced which affirmed that "It is our duty . . . also to strive for the formation of a Mass Party . . ." Eden and Cedar Paul reporting the conference in the "Workers' Republic" (8th April, 1922), say "The discussion . . . turned on the question as to what was really meant by the Third International slogan, of the Mass Party." However, although "the discussion seemed to leave unsolved the problem precisely what the Third International means by a Mass Party," the resolution was carried. Puzzling, you say? Not at all: they knew what it meant on the astral plane.

From the *Communist* (25th March) I find that the Communist Party's "historic mission" is "the leadership of the working masses — — —."

Of course, the "working masses" already have leaders, heaps of them, but these it seems are not good leaders: "Watch them," say the Communists.

Why are they not good ones? One reason say the Communists is that they have lost contact and sympathy with the rank and file.

But E. and C. Paul, two of the stars, say "the official group (of the C.P.G.B.) unfortunately consists of persons who have become professional politicians and are removed thereby from the activities of working class life" and "the slogan 'watch your leaders' is as necessary in the Communist Party as in the Trade Unions." (*Workers' Republic*, 8th April).

Not only that but although Stewart says a mass party "takes leadership of the masses, not by going back to where they are, but by taking them from where they are to where they ought to be," his fellow member Brain says "they had found by experience that the workers did not come out of the craft unions to the revolutionary movement; they stayed where they were. They would not come out so the Communist Party had to go to them." (*Communist*, 25th March).

(This points to phisic communication with Mahomet, who solved a little problem of his own on just such lines as these).

Some there were like Leckie who thought that it was the party which was going to lead the masses and therefore wanted in it "only those who really understood

CURRENCY ILLUSIONS.

To the Editor,
Dear Sir,

I am writing on a somewhat perplexing subject, that of Currency. The views of Noah Ablett which I present here, are in my opinion not Marxian, and I shall be obliged if you will give your comments and endeavour to throw some light on the question.

In "Easy Outlines of Economics" on pages 49 and 50, under the heading "The Paradox of Paper Money," he states the following theory:—Given a certain amount of commodities the quantity of gold which can remain in circulation is definitely limited; but if gold is replaced by paper, the quantity of paper money which can circulate is not limited. Consequently, if the quantity of money required in circulation is one million sovereigns, and two million pound notes are introduced instead, then the commodity previously valued at £1 will want two one pound notes in exchange; if another million notes are introduced the £1 commodity will want three notes in exchange and so on. Ablett explains this by saying that the laws of currency have been violated. Now I understand him to mean that the prices of commodities are determined by the excessive number of notes in circulation, which to me appears to be a negation of the labour theory of value, on the basis of which alone I had thought prices understandable.

To illustrate this, let us take any two dissimilar commodities; for instance, a pair of boots and a bicycle. We know that both are useful and have shape, weight, and colour, but when we put them in exchange relation we find that none of the above attributes can determine how the value of one corresponds to the value of the other. Examination however shows that they have one thing in common, they are both the products of human labour. This provides the rod with which to measure their value, just as distance is measured with a foot rule.

The use of a universal equivalent, e.g., gold, as a measure of value, enables all commodities to express their value in exchange, in one substance; that is, it gives their price in money terms. This serves instead of expressing the value of each commodity in so many hours of labour, time necessary

Communism." This of course was absurd. What has the Communist Party, the party of "action" to do with an understanding of Communism? Murphy is of the opinion that "only a small minority of our party has any idea of the significance of the mighty task before us" and as a writer in the *Worker's Republic* (official organ of the Communist Party of Ireland) remarked, not only do they not understand now, but lots of them never will; the revolution will be here before that can happen!

No, it is evidently the "professional politicians" who are to lead. "It is one thing to call upon the Party leadership to give the lead, another thing to put into operation that leadership." (Murphy.) While Walter Newbold favours affiliation to the Labour Party, but temporarily opposes it, because he believes "that at this juncture we have not had the constituent parts of the Communist Party sufficiently long together, we have not welded them sufficiently into an intelligent party understanding the implications of political action for us to be able to take them as a party into the Labour Party." (*Communist*, March 25th). (Italics mine).

Excellent advice that "Watch your leaders"—for the members of the Communist Party.

As for Labour Party affiliation it is interesting to note that while the Communist Party proposes to insist on "freedom of criticism and freedom of action," inside the Labour party (if it gets in), a *Daily Herald* correspondent writing on the L.C.C. elections stated with regard to Inkpin, who, although a Communist, ran as Labour candidate, that "it should be clearly understood . . . that Inkpin has definitely agreed to the Labour programme and will act in accordance with Labour Party decisions if desired." (28th February, 1922).

It is all now perfectly clear. The "working masses" will watch their leaders, on the advice of the Communist Party. The latter's members will watch their leaders on the advice of Eden and Cedar Paul. While the leaders themselves will have their eyes fixed on Whitehead's hobgoblins and other divine and satanic sprites who sit up aloft and watch over the tribe of Labour fakirs!

Could the revolutionary movement be in better hands than these?

R. BIRD.

for their production. If in our example a pair of boots cost £1, and a bicycle £8, it is at once seen that these different prices represent different values.

Now, if on the introduction of an excessive issue of notes we have to give £2 and £16 for boots and bicycle, where previously we gave £1 and £8 respectively, what will have happened? One of three things must have taken place. Either (1) the value of the boots and the bicycle have increased; also the value of the sovereign measured by Treasury notes, but the value of boots and bicycle to a far higher degree, or (2) the value of gold has fallen, while the values of the boots and the bicycle are the same, thus necessitating more gold in circulation and a higher price for the boots and the bicycle, or (3) the value of gold is the same, but the value of the boots and bicycle have increased.

While I agree that only a given quantity of gold can circulate, I do not see how an unlimited quantity of notes can remain in circulation. An excess of notes, like an excess of sovereigns over the quantity required for circulating the commodities, would lie idle in the banks.

Anyway, if the high cost of living is a result of the so-called excess of notes in circulation, how is it that the Treasury note will buy as much as the sovereign? Again, in the United States of America, where there is a gold medium, we find the cost of living as high as it is here.

Finally, I am told that Marx in "Capital," volume I., page 144, (Kerr), under the heading of "Coins and Symbols of Value," deals with Noah Ablett's point in this way:—If the quantity of paper money issued be double the amount required, then as a matter of fact, £1 would be the money name, not of a quarter of an ounce, but of one-eighth of an ounce of gold. The effect would be the same as if an alteration had taken place in the function of gold as a standard of price. Those values that were previously expressed by the price of £1 would now be expressed by the price of £2. I ask for information on this point: What does it all mean?

Yours for Socialism,

EDWARD LITTLER.

In no subject, except perhaps that of religion, is mankind so prone to accept statements without enquiry or examination, as in the matter of money. As Marx says, "the wildest theories" prevail upon the question. An illustration from present circumstances will show how easy it is to mislead people on this matter.

When prices were at their height, shortly after the war, one of the "explanations" put forward by the Capitalist Press, and repeated by Labour College writers and members of the Labour Party, was that the rise in prices was largely due to "the inflation of the currency." In both articles and correspondence in the SOCIALIST STANDARD, we have pointed out the falsity of this claim, and have shown that, both from the quantity of currency notes issued compared with prices, and from the fact that the "Bradbury" is convertible, no inflation has taken place.

Money as a measure of value and a medium of circulation, is a necessity under a system of commodity production on a large scale. It is the "universal commodity," set aside for the above purposes in a system where private ownership of the means of life is the ruling factor. Hence, the futility of all the schemes that attempt to solve the social evils by juggling with one item, the currency, while leaving the others intact. As money is a result of the private ownership of the means of life, it is obvious that it cannot be abolished until the cause is removed.

The commodity in general use as money, in the western world, is gold. On the average, the amount of gold exchanged for a given commodity is the quantity that has taken the same amount of social labour time to produce as the commodity has taken. To guarantee the unit of money as to quality, weight, etc., it is issued under Government control.

Inside any national boundary where social conditions are fairly stable, it is easy to replace gold with tokens or symbols for purposes of circulation. In fact, in every country with a "gold standard," metal tokens, usually silver or copper, are used for purposes of small change. Paper notes may also be substituted inside a particular country. In general, this paper is issued under one of two systems.

In one system, such as prevails in this

country to-day, the notes are "convertible" into gold upon demand at some central institution, like the Bank of England. It is easily seen that, so long as the promise to pay gold holds good—or is believed to hold good—the notes will exchange at their face denomination, and no inflation of such a currency can take place.

Under the second system, the notes are issued as "legal tender," without any promise to redeem them in gold. This is called an "inconvertible" issue. Inside the national boundary, and for home produced commodities, these notes function similarly to the "convertible" ones, and their issue has no particular effect upon prices under normal circumstances.

Outside of the country issuing notes, the position will depend upon certain other factors. First of these is the confidence of the outsiders in the promise to pay gold in the case of the "convertible" notes. Where there is full confidence in this promise, the notes will circulate at their face denomination, less the amount required to cover the cost of carrying gold to the country in question. If this confidence is lacking, the degree in which it falls below "full" will be shown by the rate of exchange.

With "inconvertible" notes, the matter is somewhat more complicated. These notes will be taken at their power to purchase gold or goods in the world's markets. It is at this point that a great confusion of thought exists on currency matters.

An examination will show that the power of purchase possessed by these notes is based upon the resources of the country issuing them. If the notes are issued in such quantities that their face denomination exceeds these resources, their power of purchase abroad will fall in a similar ratio. This brings forward the factor that has confused Mr. Ablett and so many writers in the Capitalist Press—the factor of *Credit*.

When Mr. Ablett states (p. 50): "Governments may easily inflate the currency by printing pieces of paper," it is a pity he does not state what they could do with this paper when printed. Moreover, he has been refuted in principle, as long ago as 1682, when a certain writer stated:—

"If the wealth of a nation could be decupled by

a proclamation, it were strange that such proclamation have not long since been made by our Governors."

This writer was the famous William Petty, and the above quotation from his work is given on p. 73 of "Capital." (Sonnenschein.—Ed.)

As Mr. Ablett, probably for quite good reasons, fails to give any description of the functioning of a paper currency, a short account may be useful here.

If the government of a country with an inconvertible paper currency requires certain commodities, such as guns or battle-ships, it may order firms in its own country to build them, or it may order them from abroad. In the latter case, it may offer to pay in its own currency—if necessary, printing the notes for this purpose—but this would *not* be inflation, as the currency would only be issued to the amount of the prices to be paid. To the firms supplying the commodities, the notes would be useful only so far as they would purchase gold or goods in the world's markets at their face denomination. If the government were to order goods beyond the capacity of the taxes to meet the bill, then their *credit* would fall, and their notes—as they stood, without printing a single one extra—would fall below their face denomination outside of their own country. The printing of more notes to meet this fall would not alter the situation, or the price level of the notes. It is this extension of *credit* that the would-be experts confuse as an "inflation" of currency.

The government in question might purchase gold with its notes, to pay the bill, but of course the more usual way is to issue bonds for the amount, on the taxes of the country, and pass these bonds through the banks and financial houses.

The huge increase in demand, accompanied by an enormous extension of credit, that has taken place between governments and firms, during and since the war, has been the great cause of the rise in prices. Such rise has necessitated a large increase in the currency to meet the demands of business. This obvious fact has been inverted in the minds of the shallow apologists for Capitalism, who claim the rise in prices has been due to "the inflation of the currency."

J. F.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 3s. 0d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

JUNE



1922

COUNCILS OF THE "PEACEFUL."

Some time ago there was great jubilation (for the worker's benefit!) in the papers over America's advocacy of reducing or abolishing armies and navies. A conference was held in Washington and all powers agreed to reduce armaments—so long as each was left better armed than any of the others! Throughout the business America was hailed as an advocate of peace.

During the discussions, however, America was significantly silent on the question of aerial armament. A little while after we learned that American chemists had devised a method of using deadly germs whereby aerial machines could drop small quantities (germ bombs) on to cities and destroy thousands of the inhabitants more efficaciously than by the cruder method of ordinary explosive bombs.

From the *Daily News* (10/5/1922) we learn that America has progressed still further in her peaceful pursuits. American inventors have now devised an almost noiseless and invisible aeroplane.

"The significance of such experiments was revealed the other day, when a huge 'bomber,' carrying a load equivalent to enough missiles to lay streets in ruins, climbed—thanks to the special preparation of its engines—until it was at a height impossible during the raiding of the war."

"Here is seen the full menace, the winged monster, which, with devices able to silence the roar of its high-flying motors, has added to its terrors laboratory secrets which—applied to a machine already high in the air against a vast elusive background—confer on it the power of a virtual invisibility."

In face of such things as this workers are still being deluded into supporting campaigns for the reduction of armaments and the abolishing of war. Those who control such campaigns have the object in view of reducing the expenses of running the Capitalist system. The success of such campaigns would increase unemployment but would not materially assist in preventing future wars.

The pretty little game of political chess that is going on at Geneva, and the recent stir over the action of one of the competitors in the Russian oil scramble, should make it obvious to anyone that war is never likely to be a remote contingency so long as capitalism lasts.

Comparatively small wars have been going on ever since "peace" was established! But another one of the gigantic kind has already been shadowed by no less a person than Lloyd George—the man who was so emphatic about the last big struggle, signifying the end of all wars. More humorous still it is the Allies that are falling out now—falling out over the spoils of "victory."

Commenting on the general situation the *Daily News* (10/5/22) says:—

"Nobody will deny that the danger of war, at war on a vast scale, within the life's span of those who have survived the tremendous slaughter of recent years, is real and formidable."

Once more let us press the question: What concern of the working class is any war except the class war? All wars outside of the class war are waged in the interests of the Capitalists. Although the workers do the fighting the only reward they obtain is that obtained by the survivors of the too recent carnage in Europe—homes that require heroism to live in.

ATTENTION!

Will those interested in the work of the Edinburgh Branch of the Party communicate with:—

ANDREW PORTER,
12a, Kings Road,
Portobello.

PHAËTON.

FRAGMENT OF A CONVERSATION.

You Socialists (said the Apologist for the Present Social Order) make the mistake of thinking that capitalism is evil in itself.

Nothing (said the Socialist) is evil in itself. It is in our judgment only that things appear as good or evil. Hamlet's "There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so," is sound philosophy. Capitalism is therefore good in some men's eyes, evil in others; and it is in the nature of things that it chiefly seems good to those who benefit by it—the masters, and evil mainly to those who suffer by it—the workers.

But it is not a philosophical point that I wish to make (explained the A. for the P.S.O.). I wish to suggest that what you and I as workers regard as evils are the fruit of human failings, which would give a similar crop of evils under any other system.

The truth (replied the Socialist) is precisely the reverse. Within capitalist society, let men be never so desirous of harmony, they cannot but collide in the process of producing wealth; in the socialist commonwealth, let a minority be ever so rapacious, it has not the means to enslave the majority as now. This is not to say, however, that the socialist pronounces capitalism purely evil. On the contrary, he holds that each succeeding organisation of society was necessary to the development of man's power over Nature—capitalism among the rest. From the point of view of human progress it is therefore good, until it has served its purpose, and becomes a chain instead of a means of advance.

That time has now arrived.

The old Greeks had a story of Phaëton, son of Phœbus. He would drive the chariot of the sun, which daily moved across the firmament and shed blessed beams upon the world. But the eager steeds disdained his control; and the unguided car, sweeping too near the earth, blasted the life it was designed to nourish.

Economic teams have their Phaëtons too.

The continuous improvement in methods of production extracts an ever-richer return from human labour: makes highly productive even the labour of the weak and unskilled: makes possible that mass production which might minister to the susten-

ance, the culture, the leisure of mankind. But these forces capitalism, though it has fostered, cannot fitly employ, because it is ultimately concerned not with satisfying human needs, but with selling for profit. So they operate to create surfeit on one hand, emptiness on the other, and run to huge surpluses which compel spasmodic interruptions of work. Like the radiant, mythical horses they plunge and strive. Misery and death are in their track, where life and joy should be.

Socialism will harness them better.

A.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- "Is Trade Unionism Sound."—By J. H. BUNTING. Benn Bros., Ltd. 2/6.
"Men and Steel."—By MARY HEATON VORSE. Labour Publishing Co. 3/6.
"Workmen's Compensation."—By W. H. THOMPSON. Labour Publishing Co. 2/6.
"Truism of Statecraft."—By Hon. BRUCE SMITH, K.C. Longmans. 7/6.
"Settlement of Wage Disputes."—By HERBERT FEIS. The Macmillan Co. \$2.25.

£1,000 FUND.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Already Acknowledged	794	12	9½			
Omitted from previous list				2	0	0
F.J.H.						
Donations:—						
G.H.C., Bristol	5	0				
Geo. Evans, Winnipeg	8	3				
Parker, C., West Ham	5	0				
Hanley Branch	3	6				
"W.H."	3	0				
"Tom" pp. E. Fairbrother	5	0				
Kirk, F. J., New Zealand	13	2				
R/S, N.W. London	1	0	0			
"E.P."	10	0				
				3	12	11
Stamp Books:—						
B/n (73)	5	0				
Tottenham (10)	3	0				
Swansea U.V.W. (99/100)	2	0	0			
A.S.C. (22/64)	1	9				
G/n (70)	5	0				
M/ll (72)	1	3				
B/n (73)	2	6				
N.W.L. (12)	2	6				
" (15)	3	6				
				3	4	6
Collection at Conference				11	0	
Proceeds from Pictures				6	0	0
Sale of Books, Photos, &c.				12	1	
				£810	13	3½

16:5:22/A.S.C.

Correction:—The amount stated in last issue as—"Already acknowledged £725 17 9½" should have been "£782 19 9½."

HAS TRADE UNIONISM FAILED?

In the "Penny Pictorial" (4th March), Lord Askwith gives his answer to this question. He writes as an "expert"; for, as chief Industrial Commissioner, 1911-1919, he negotiated in more than 100 trade disputes, and whatever his knowledge of Trade Unionism, he must know a great deal about the Trade Unions. Nevertheless, his answer does not add to the discussion much that is likely to be useful or illuminating to the many workers, who, while equally interested, lack his special experience.

It is really not surprising that Lord Askwith's statement is unsatisfactory, because he never troubles to explain the object of Trade Unionism, and without that in mind, how can it be decided whether or not there has been a failure?

It is remarkable that such an omission is made, for it must be clear, after a moment's consideration, that unless there is an accepted basis of judgment, in this instance the aim which brought the trade union movement into being, there can be no useful discussion, and the only criterion possible is Lord Askwith's own view of what Trade Unionism ought to have done. For instance, if a number of people joined together to bring the heathen to abstain from cannibalism, Lord Askwith might examine the evidence and make the charge of failure if, after years of preaching, the heathen were still eating missionaries; he could not, however, allege failure merely because they *killed* the missionaries, although he personally and many of the members (the missionaries included) objected equally strongly to murder.

The only measure of the success or failure of trade unionism is the progress made towards its goal, whatever that may be.

Lord Askwith points to the following, which appear to him to be signs of failure: Recent falling membership, exhaustion of funds, the hampering of trade by working restrictions, unemployment, direct action, lack of co-ordination, strikes instead of conciliation, and the consequent raising of prices, and lastly, in his eyes doubtless the most serious, the failure of some unions to "lead the way" to lower wages! On the other hand, he notes with approval the more orderly conduct of strikes, fewer

strikes, amalgamations, and better informed members.

Now on examination, we find that this is not so much the success attained for trade unionism, but the methods particular unions have adopted, and the difficulties of maintaining effective organisation, with which Lord Askwith concerns himself. These might be causes of failure, if there has been failure, but they are certainly not evidence that there has been failure.

While the organisation of the workers is a necessary activity for trade unions, it is not an end in itself, and loss of members, while it may reflect on the wisdom of certain policies, is not a proof of the failure of trade unionism. It may, for example, be caused by general trade depression. It may be remarked here that had the trade unions not lost in membership, there might as a consequence have been more strikes and greater resistance to wage reductions, yet Lord Askwith classes together loss of members and too many strikes as signs of failure.

Again, it is doubtful if even the most anti-working class of the trade union officials would proclaim wage reducing as an object of organisation.

As for the few things which meet with his approval, even if good in themselves, Lord Askwith does not show them to be the conscious product of trade unionism.

In short, he does not seem to be able to help us much, and we must go elsewhere for information.

First, what are trade unions, and why do they exist? Sidney Webb defines a trade union as "a continuous association of wage earners for the purpose of maintaining or improving the condition of their working lives." To understand their origin, it is necessary to have a clear idea of the conditions from which they spring. They are found to grow up wherever and whenever the capitalist system of society comes into being. Capitalism has not always been, and is, in fact, of only recent development in human society, and the rise of the trade unions coincides nearly enough with the industrial revolution which marked the change from individual handicraft to large scale factory production. As Capitalism extends its area over the hitherto undeveloped countries, Japan, India, and China, for instance, so do the workers, whose status is more or less violently upset by the changing eco-

nomic conditions, combine to form trade unions.

The outstanding features of the capitalist system are these: The ownership by a class small in numbers of the bulk of the means of producing wealth, the land, the railways, mines and factories; and the total absence of property from the hands of the remaining members of society, the great majority. The wealth by which both classes live is produced by the larger class only, by the workers; but the latter may not use the means of producing wealth except by permission of the capitalists who own them. The condition of such use is that the capitalists who produce nothing own the whole of the product. Of this they return a relatively small part in the form of wages. The capitalists are able to live on the wealth which they do not produce, because they own the machinery of production, while the workers, being propertyless, must sell their bodily energies for wages.

We have here a dominant and a slave class, the gulf between them being no less marked than that between chattel slave and slave owner. The main difference is that the wage worker faces the employing class apparently as an equal, because he has the political status of a citizen. He, the seller of his labour power, and the employer, the buyer of his labour power, dispute about the price of sale as do buyers and sellers of other commodities, but with important differences. He, the worker, must sell his commodity week by week or month by month, or he will starve, whereas the merchant who sells goods can usually wait his time without being subjected to the pressure of dire necessity. He can diminish or stop production if the market is unfavourable, but the worker cannot stave off the pangs of hunger until a more fitting opportunity.

Now, just as boot manufacturers combine to keep their prices up, instead of competing with each other, so workers organise to raise or maintain the level of their wages. Where one man is helpless, a body of men may succeed in enforcing certain demands on their employers.

These organisations are trade unions. They are the product of capitalism, and are to be found wherever capitalism is. They could not arise nor continue except where the capitalist organisation of society prevails.

Now "maintaining and improving the

condition of working lives" covers a wide field indeed. It has included raising wages, shortening hours, bettering workshop and factory conditions, obtaining more holidays, and, shortsightedly enough, preserving restrictions which are held to protect certain skilled crafts. Perhaps that which loomed largest in the minds of the early trade unionists was simply the desire for a shield against the ruthless exploitation to which they were subjected in capitalism's early days. Now, has trade unionism done these things? A brief examination of the facts will show to what extent it can be said to have failed. It is only needful to give a few illustrations, which, however, are typical of the position all over the capitalist world.

Take this country first. Real wages, that is, the amount of food, clothing, etc., that money wages will buy, have fallen during the war, and are now generally less than in 1914, which again showed a decline on the closing years of the nineteenth century. While shorter hours have been won during the war, an attack seems to be brewing to bring about an increase again, and in many industries concessions have already had to be made. It is frankly admitted by Sidney Webb, in his "History of Trade Unionism," that trade union restrictions lost during the war were not regained in anything like their entirety afterwards; as he tersely puts it, the workers were "done." There is at the same time a constant endeavour by employers to remove protective machinery set up by Act of Parliament to deal with wages and conditions of labour. The Factory Acts themselves are in undoubted danger. Skilled craftsmanship is now rapidly ceasing to give a guarantee of comfort and security, a tendency hastened, no doubt, by the experiences of the war period in the employment of labourers on tasks hitherto regarded as the province of trained men only. The A.E.U., in its October, 1921, Report, admits that during the war, "the average time rate of the skilled fitter and turner never kept pace with nor equalled the increased cost of living." ("Industrial News," March, 1922), and the Boilermakers' report for September of the same year contains this: "It took us six years to get 100 per cent. on wages, with the cost of living on an average of 133 per cent. up over the whole period." Again in 1851, the A.S.E. (now the A.E.U.)

was demanding: (1) The abolition of piece-work; (2) the abolition of overtime, and (3) the discharge of labourers on self-acting machines, while in 1922, 71 years after, the officials of that union are recommending their members "to accept an agreement recognising the unlimited right of the bosses to control overtime. The operating of machines by 'semi-skilled' labour is involved, so also are the piece-work prices for such operating" ("Industrial News," March, 1922).

Lastly, there are 2,000,000 workers out of regular employment, and the fear of dismissal is an ever present nightmare in every trade. It is this prevalence of unemployment which is at the same time the terror of the worker, the goad which makes him organise, and the immediate cause of the weakness of his organisation. No trade union can successfully fight unemployment. The latter is a necessary feature of the system inside which trade unions function, and it marks the limit of their usefulness.

In America, the standard of living in 15 chief industries has been declining since 1896; between 1896 and 1907, by 6 per cent., and over the whole 24 years to 1920 by nearly 25 per cent. ("American Economic Review," Sept., 1921). America, too, has its 6,000,000 unemployed. This is, in fact, a common experience in the victorious as well as the defeated and neutral nations, in spite of the fact that in 1920 the number of workers organised in trade unions reached a record figure, and represented a much higher percentage than ever before of the total number of wage earners.

Wages are still rapidly falling, without hope of a break, and even the most solidly established unions cannot hope to resist effectively. The engineers are crippled by unemployment, the miners shattered by unsuccessful strikes and the decline of the coal trade; the railwaymen forced to accept merely with protest dismissals and wage reductions. The unskilled and agricultural unions, and others who had artificial growth stimulated by the war-time labour shortage, and by the setting up of Wages Boards, Trades Boards, etc., by the Government, have to face disastrous withdrawal of members, discouraged because unable to understand the failure of their officials to prevent wage reductions. The position is desperate, and, owing to lack of real knowledge of the system of society, some

of the effects of which they are organising to counteract, the workers as a whole are apathetic and despairing of the future.

Can we then agree that because the workers' position is wretched, that trade unionism has failed? By no means. The wretchedness is the outcome of the exploitation to which the workers are subjected inside the capitalist system, and it can with truth be said, therefore, that trade unionism has not touched the root causes of the evils which it fought. As against that, however, the workers' position could and undoubtedly would have been much worse than it is if they had not had what protection their trade unions did provide. Furthermore, it would indeed be suicidal to discard the existing weapon while the need for it continues.

Yet the fact remains that the workers are still wage-earners without comfort or security or hope of advancement.

What is the cause and the remedy?

We may first reject most of Lord Askwith's brilliant notions. A recognition of the class division in society shows them to be untrue and often simply ridiculous.

The capitalists as a class do no useful work in the social production of wealth, but by virtue of their being owners of property they draw revenue from the mass of wealth produced.

The more they receive, the less there remains for the workers, and *vice-versa*, at any given moment.

The relative amounts will depend on the amount of pressure each side can apply in the constant struggle.

Unemployment is a necessity for the continued existence of the capitalist system, for the removal of its cause would mean the cessation of the production on a capitalist—that is, a profit-making—basis.

The advocacy of conciliation instead of strikes is based on the foolish idea that there can be an ideal basis of negotiation between Capital and Labour, between robber and robbed. Each is, in fact, entitled to what it can get, and as external circumstances, trade prosperity, and the condition of the labour market change, so must the quantity of force at the disposal of each of the combatants change. Permanent equilibrium is therefore impossible, and perpetually recurring disputes inevitable.

Lastly, prices are dependent on factors which are not directly altered by variations in wages, as is implied by Lord Askwith.

A seller will ask as much as the market will stand, and the condition of the market is not directly affected by the payment of an increased wage to his operatives. For instance, according to the Royal Commission on Grain Markets (Saskatchewan, 1913), the average cost of producing wheat in Canada in 1909 was 48 cents per bushel and the selling price 81 cents. Both cost of production and prices showed a steady alteration during the four following years, and in 1913, while cost had risen to 55 cents, the price had fallen to 66 cents.

Again, it does not even follow that the cost to the manufacturer is increased by the raising of wages, as the increased wage per head of the employees may be balanced by a reduction in the number employed, while at the same time the introduction of improved machinery correspondingly raises the output of each worker. If the cost does rise, then the employer's profits suffer.

There are other explanations offered. The form of organisation is attacked, and industrial unionism and workshop committees, etc., are held out as remedies. Now while it is agreed that the present unions have not made the most effective use of their power during or since the war, no change of form can solve the problem of unemployment. No industrial organisation can hope to meet with success the state forces at the disposal of the employers, or wring appreciable concessions at a time when there is a great excess of workers over the number the employers are prepared to engage, or when trade is so bad as to make it more economical to a considerable section of capitalists to close down altogether, or severely to restrict production. Solidarity alone is not an effective defence against the weapon of starvation.

Then it is alleged that many officials are traitors to their members, but the treachery of certain labour leaders cannot disguise the fact that the pressure of the overstocked labour market so far affected the masses of organised workers that they did and still do loyally follow these betrayers, accepting as correct the necessity for their actions and the reasonableness of their explanations. Treachery in leaders is itself an effect, and not an important cause of failure. J. H. Thomas is a wolf because his members are sheep; he is also a particularly bold wolf, because he knows his members have a powerful liking for his howl. J. H.

Thomas is a defender of the capitalist system, and its mascot the monarchy, because he knows his members are also defenders of the capitalist system. He attends court functions because his members are still more interested in the wedding of "our Princess" than in the starvation and humiliation which wage slavery means for them and their daughters. Leaders are followed because they say and do those things of which members in the main approve. The members approve because the capitalist press approves, and the press is their chief source of information. Does anyone believe that the workers would follow a lead in an opposite direction against their present inclinations, and in face of opposition from all the organs of capitalist propaganda? No, not if Thomas himself led them. While leaders have jobs to consider, they will play for safety; that is, as long as there are workers who, lacking knowledge, wish to be led.

In workers organisations, as in modern states, only those actions and policies are in the last resort possible which meet with the active approval or at least the acquiescence of the rank and file. The moonshine of the theory of leading the masses to revolution is sufficiently exposed by its adherents, Eden and Cedar Paul, in the "Communist Review," March, 1922, where they write of Russia in these words:—

"Despite the dictatorship of the proletariat, her policy is in a large measure dictated by the peasantry—a reactionary class constituting four-fifths of the population."

The dictators are dictated to!

The trade unions have not aimed at overthrowing capitalism. They endeavoured to make capitalism tolerable for the workers; a hopeless endeavour, because there can be no salvation for the workers inside the system. The continual existence of the exploitation of the one class pre-supposes, as well, as their robbery, also their subordination to another class. The condition of the workers could not even improve relative to its previous state, because the tendency—too obvious to be ignored—of capitalist development is in the direction of simplification of labour from skilled to unskilled, and the replacing of the craftsman by the factory hand, and the trained specialist by the routine worker, the replacing of the man by the machine, on which he becomes increasingly dependent.

To maintain and improve the standard of living or to increase security in face of this would have necessitated a power greater than that of the capitalist class, the use of which power must have revolutionised society. The trade unions had no such power, and what is more would not have been prepared to use it if they had. The workers have not wanted and do not want to abolish capitalism. When they wish to do so, the power is at hand for their use, but before they have the will to abolish capitalism, the workers have first to understand what capitalism is, and that its replacement is an immediate possibility.

The workers are kept in subjection by all the forces and institutions of the state, and these in turn are at the disposal of the capitalists because the workers permit them to be. The state power of the capitalist class is derived from the representative assemblies elected for the most part by the votes of the workers. The workers do not organise on the economic field in order to overthrow the capitalist system, nor do they take part in elections for such a purpose. Even if they had the will to face the issue out to its logical conclusion, and recognised that their fight must be against the organised might of the capitalist state, they would yet be doomed to failure if they did not understand the working of the machinery of government; if, like the South African miners, they pitted the puny strength of a few men armed with sporting rifles, and a few more "armed" with pick-axes against well-equipped, numerous and adequately supported troops. That the workers mentioned did lack understanding, even of their class position, is evidenced by their attempt to exclude the unorganised black workers, and by their inviting alliance from the Nationalists; an alliance, that is, which would have put control of the forces which defeated them into the hands of another section of the capitalist class.

When the workers understand the social system, their exploitation, and their relation to the capitalist class, they will organise for the specific purpose of capturing the machinery of government from the capitalist class, in order that they may build a new social system based on the common ownership of the means of wealth production, under the protection it will afford.

The workers have the remedy for their

sufferings in their hands; only when they are class conscious will they use it.

H.

THE STORY OF MR. PENNY.

Happy the man who can reflect that when the call came that his King and Country needed him, he was not found wanting. Virtue may have to serve as its own reward in many spheres, but the motherland has never been a niggard in giving her gratitude a tangible form. True, something like a million gave their little lives when called upon; but are not their names inscribed on multitudinous war memorials at every street corner? Are not their sorrowing dependents saved from the wolves of poverty by kindly Pensions Boards?

Some, by bodily infirmity, or other disability were prevented from meeting the hated Prussians face to face. To these fell the humbler task of defending the domestic hearth from the depredations of domestic Prussians. Take the case of Mr. C. E. Penny, as recorded in the *Daily Mail* of April 13th, 1922, under the caption, "Man who broke a Strike." When the supreme call came in 1914, Mr. Penny joined the Royal Army Service Corps, but invalided out within a few months, volunteered for the Civil Service. In the strenuous years that followed it was he, who on behalf of the Ministry of Food, prosecuted nearly 50,000 profiteers. This should have been enough to earn imperishable glory for any man, and at least a humble niche in the National Valhalla. But his most brilliant work was yet to come. During the railway strike of 1919, "it has been said that it was the marvellous transport scheme which he evolved that broke the strike."

"He had a genius for organising transport. In his little office he had a table resembling genealogical trees, and poring over these various lines of lorry transport he saw that no department went unprovided for. The rest of his time was spent in visiting every corner of the country during that strenuous period."

Can any reward be too high for a man like that? Well, yes, it can! There are certain recognisable and reasonable limits. He was given a position in the Board of Trade's Food Department. Here at last he could rest upon his laurels, assured at least of a competency and comforted in the

tangible recognition of his country's gratitude. But alas, the *Daily Mail*, with a brevity almost brutal, tells us in the same sentence, that, "he left about a month ago owing to departmental economy."

The worst is to tell. He left his boarding house in Clanricarde Gardens on April 7th, and left a note in which he stated he was one of the thousands of workless and penniless men. He was found dead in bed in an apartment house in Brighton, with a tube attached to a gas bracket in his mouth. Let it never be said that Capital forgets those who serve it well and truly in its hour of need!

W. T. H.

A LEISURED CLASS.

OPEN LETTER TO MIKE, ESQ.

Dear Fellow-traveller Mike,

You do not know me, and I only know you are Mike because your mate called you by name. You sat at the other end of the 'bus and discoursed of a leisured class; and the mate agreed with all you said. I am sure you are a nice man. Your turns of speech showed that you read; and I think you would be found in the gallery at the Old Vic. on Shakespeare and opera nights. I should have liked a word with you, and as I did not get it I write you a letter. If you do not see it, perhaps others may who think like you.

"In spite of all these socialists say," you observed, "there's a good deal to be said for a leisured class. Think of the special benefits it can give to society, having so much time and opportunity."

Mike, we have had a leisured class for centuries. Has it bestowed benefits on mankind in excess of those contributed by men productively occupied? Has it furnished a preponderant share of the exceptional services? Not from its ranks came our Arkwrights and Stevensons, our Shakespeares and Burns's, our Mozarts and Beethovens. Many of the greatest benefactors of their race did their work in despite of lack of leisure, in despite of the discouragement and persecution of their masters. You and I can dimly guess by how much we should be the gainers if they had enjoyed their master's freedom. By all means let our artists, investigators and philosophers have every opportunity for their

special work. But so long as Nature is so ill-advised as not to observe our class distinctions, they will be found not chiefly in any class favoured by economic conditions, but scattered throughout the community. Your plea for an idle class, therefore, becomes one for the utmost possible leisure for everyone, an end not to be attained by having the many workers serve the few idlers all day long.

But you said, "What right have we workers to interfere, anyhow? Even suppose they waste their time—ar'n't they enjoying the results of their exertions, or their fathers?" No. Mike, to know what it is they are really enjoying you must understand this. Human labour power is capable of producing more than is necessary to maintain itself. It is precisely this quality which makes it useful to the Capitalist, and you as the repository of labour power a man to be employed. The surplus he appropriates. Realised in sale it constitutes his profit: and the fortune which, if successful, he amasses, is but the embodied labour of his employees. If he himself takes part in his business, then some proportion of his fortune is the fruit of his own labour. But as you know, no producer of commodities grows rich by his own work alone. Even so-called self-made men, who at first are workmen, employ others as soon as they profitably can: and many a member of the idle class, so far from taking a share in the making of his money, hardly knows where it is invested. Thus their wealth, whether they spend it on themselves or bequeath it to their heirs, is by no means the harvest of their own industry, but the product of the hands and brains of men like you and your mate, who cannot take your ease but when you have leisure thrust upon you. Then, your employer conceives, you will be so busy contriving new blessings for humanity that you will have no time to eat—and omits to provide accordingly.

Your trouble is that you are too disinterested. When you discover the part which the leisured ones actually play in Capitalist economy, you will be less solicitous for their welfare and more for your own. You can learn quite a lot about it from this number of the *Socialist Standard*. But take it next month and every month, Mike! It gives the knowledge you want!

Yours fraternally,
A.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Mattheu-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spiceal-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Sec., 142 Bulwer-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER AND DISTRICT.—Communications to Sec., 11 Davis-st., Longsight, M/C. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Sundays, at 3 p.m.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 3, Lyveden-rd., Tooting, S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays, at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 19, Beechfield-rd., Finsbury Pk., N.4. Branch meets Saturdays 8.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN. Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 6 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 5.30 p.m.
Manor Park, Earl of Essex, 7.30 p.m.
Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 a.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.

Fridays:

Tottenham, Junction Clyde-road and Phillip-lane, 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 215. Vol. 18.]

LONDON, JULY, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

FROM AN AFRICAN CORRESPONDENT.

17th May, 1922.

As you may have noticed, events in Nairobi took a serious turn about two months ago. The Press, as usual, describe the occurrence as a riot, though in actuality the first exercise of violence proceeded from the forces of "law and order." They arrested a proletarian propagandist of democratic ideas, a native named Harry Thuku, on a "special warrant," which appears to obviate the necessity of a public trial as a preliminary to imprisonment. As a result of this, several hundreds of natives assembled and held a mass meeting outside the police barracks, which lasted for something like eighteen hours! In fact, from the evening of one day till noon the next the crowd remained in the hope that their petitions to the authorities and their prayers to God (their most active spokesman being obviously mission educated) would result in the release of Thuku. The authorities, however, put their faith in things more tangible than ancestral spooks, and called out a detachment of the King's African Rifles. This in spite of the fact that up till that time neither person nor property had been damaged, and the demeanour of the crowd was (according to the evidence of the police chief) "orderly and peaceful," and reminded the local State parson of "a Sunday School picnic"; while the police were armed. The arrival of the military was the signal for the beginning of the tragedy. A stampede among the crowd took place which was subsequently described as "an attack on the barracks." The police fired, killing over a score and wounding about thirty others, whereupon they left the barracks and proceeded to clean up the streets, ably assisted by the K.A.R. At the subsequent inquiry into the incident it transpired that the police

(a native body) had fired *without orders*! But, as the learned presiding magistrate observed, "if the authority of the Government was to be maintained, the firing must be justified." And so, of course, he justified it. The casualties on the Government side were *nil*; those on the other side included women and children. No wonder the *Daily Mail* and other rags thought it necessary to drag in the bogey of Bolshevism, trusting in popular ignorance and credulity to swallow the ludicrous myth.

The causes of the agitation with which Thuku was associated were described at the beginning of the year in the pages of the *Socialist Standard*. Most important of these were the increase in Hut and Poll taxes, decrease in wages, the system of native registration and the absence of any form of political representation. Thuku was instrumental in forming the original Kikuyu Association, but as this body soon fell into the hands of a junta of Government-paid chiefs, and sought to exclude all but Kikuyu, he and others withdrew and formed the East African Association, a body aiming to unite *all* native tribes and races to gain political equality. He also incidentally exposed the corruption of the above-mentioned chiefs, as instanced in their acceptance of bribes from European planters for procuring labour! In vain did they retaliate by endeavouring to prevent their tribesmen from listening to Thuku. The natives flocked in *thousands* to his meetings, and their spontaneous demonstration following his arrest, while fatal as tactics, afforded ample evidence that they, in the mass, endorse his views. The massacre has simply intensified the bitterness with which they regard their oppressors.

E. B.

THE "RIGHT" TO LIVE.

Upon the publication of a work explaining the natural development of the world, the author Pierre Laplace, the celebrated French mathematician, was asked by Napoleon the 1st why there was no word of God in his system. Laplace replied, "Sure, I have no need of that hypothesis." And if we were asked why we had not mentioned God in our declaration of principles we should answer in a similar manner.

There was a time when the idea of a God who created, controlled and guided the universe passed practically unchallenged. The heaven and earth, the sun, moon, stars and everything including man and the most minute organism was supposed to have been conceived, fashioned and completed within the short period of six days. Whether overtime was worked we cannot say, but judging by the output no modern foreman would be likely to complain that it was not a fair week's work for one person. Primitive man being ignorant of the operation of natural laws, and living in a community of a small and scattered kind, the victim of dangers seen and unseen, created his gods through fear and ignorance. How the gods of the savage have become modified under the pressure of a continuous social development, and have resulted in the idea of one all powerful God is foreign to our purpose here. Suffice it to say that the idea of a supernatural power has considerably influenced human thought throughout the ages.

But step by step the advance of science and industry has expelled this power from its celestial throne, and now-a-days it is almost a commonplace to assert that the universe is governed by ascertainable natural laws. The Socialist sees everywhere in nature a complex chain of cause and effect, a variety of natural happenings which occur in accordance with immutable laws, leaving no room for the existence or the operation of an external power. Thus, in making a study of social relationships, we know that the movements of man grappling with the forces of nature to sustain himself, no less than the forces which mould a planet, are governed by laws. The supernatural is ruled out here as elsewhere.

The life history of the human race from the simple untutored savage to the highly skilled civilized man, shows that man has

depended entirely upon his own energy and nature given material to maintain his existence. It does not require a great amount of knowledge to see that if the mental and physical qualities of man fail him, no matter how much he may look to heaven for support, he ceases to exist.

Thus, if man is thrown back upon himself to obtain the wherewithal to live, the "God-given right to live" about which we hear so much from the priestly cult, cuts a sorry figure, and in various ages men have solicited the support of their gods or God in times of trial and trouble, implying that the final word as to the preservation of life rested with some power external. The Christian chants "Give us this day our daily bread," and although his eyes be heavenward, his thoughts cannot be separated from a knowledge of the fact that he will have to get it for himself.

Apart from a consideration of other sides of the God-given right to live idea, one has only to examine present day society to see how the "right to live" is respected. A few people monopolize the means of life, which enables them to live in luxury and affluence, while those who produce the wealth live in life long poverty, many of them dying of starvation amidst plenty. The "right to live" is here shown to be a sham and a mockery.

The right to die might be more appropriate.

Throughout all organic existence we observe the various forms of life struggling to adapt themselves to the conditions of existence for the purpose of preserving life.

The tiger tracks down its prey and devours it. The swallow devours the gnat. The ichneumon fly lays its eggs under the skin of the caterpillar where they are hatched by the warmth of the caterpillar's blood, producing a brood of larvae which devours the caterpillar alive.

In human society, although there is a code of morals to obscure the parasitism prevalent, nevertheless, it is there just the same. The policeman with his baton; the soldier with his gun; the airman with the aerial bomb all bear witness to its existence. The "right to live" of the ruling class is no other than their power to live upon the backs of the subject class. In view of what has so far been said it may be argued that if the right to live really means that there is no right but might, then the Capitalist

class are justified in holding the means of life in spite of the poverty and misery arising from their ownership. This is quite all right so long as those who starve will allow them to do so.

The Capitalists when they found the restrictions of feudalism a hindrance to their social advancement needed no other right than that of expediency, to aid them in their struggle for power, and the feudal lords did not forego their power without a struggle to retain it.

The Socialist does not direct his appeal for the establishment of Socialism to the Capitalists. He knows it would be worse than useless. No ruling class ever gave up its power of domination without being forced to do so. Make no mistake about it, when the master class are confronted with a serious attack upon the private property institution no abstract "right to live" will prevent them using all the might at their command to maintain their power. To those who think that the Capitalists may respect the rights of the workers to live as they want to, the slaughter of the communards in Paris in 1871 provides a conclusive answer. The appeal of the Socialist is directed to the working class because this class has everything to gain by the acceptance of Socialist principles. At this stage the question arises as to the means to be employed against the might of the ruling class. While we are on this point we wish to refer to a recent interpretation of an article that appeared in the *Socialist Standard* some years ago. The writer of the article in question made clear what the present writer has intended to make clear, namely, that there being no God-given right to live, the workers must look to themselves if they desire a more comfortable existence. The interpretation just referred to, is on a passage in an article entitled "Might is Right," which states: "We deserve nothing more than what we can get with our teeth and our claws." In a recent controversy this was quoted as though we favoured the stupid tactics of the broken bottle and big stick variety. The passage will not bear this interpretation except to knaves or fools. Granted that we deserve nothing more than what we can get. The question then is: Since we assert that the workers must look to themselves to get out of Capitalist conditions, by what means can they do so?

The solution of the problem lies in the conditions of the problem itself.

While it is true that the master class use their power to consolidate their domination of the working class, it is also true that this power has been handed to them by the latter. In other words at every election the workers have voted the Capitalists into power. It is as though the lamb delivered itself over to the lion. The workers must understand that they can use this political weapon in the interest of themselves. This weapon, together with the knowledge of their class subjection, is their "teeth and their claws." They must study Socialism wherein they will learn the cause of their subjection, how they are subjected, and the means by which they can combine their forces as a class and use their might to ensure the right to live a comfortable and healthy life.

R. REYNOLDS.

"The work of the individual and that of the family, the work of the factory and that of the whole society, is an organism, each part of which contributes to the whole. The contribution of each organ cannot be mechanically weighed or measured. The Socialist is quite aware that the workers are organs of the work process. He has completely given up the idea of individualising and dividing up a Communitistic product, and paying to each according to his deserts. Present society, with its misunderstood principle of *suum cuique* (each unto his own) and its grotesque justice, acts as unreasonably as the man who gives his eye an overweening care while utterly neglecting his leg. As the engineer is more careful about his smallest screws than about his big wheel, so do we desire that the product of social labour shall be divided according to the social needs, so that the strong and the weak, the swift and the clumsy, the mental and the physical labourer, in so far as they are human, shall work and enjoy in human community."

JOSEPH DIETZGEN.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the **SOCIALIST STANDARD** through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1, when regular delivery will be arranged.

LOYALTIES.

On March 20th, "The Silver Box," by John Galsworthy, was produced at the Court Theatre. The play was written some years ago, and in spite of some care in bringing details up to date, the atmosphere remains rather old-fashioned. But in essence it is as true as formerly, being concerned with the subjection of the propertyless to those who own the means of life. The economic relation is shown reflected in the privilege which in every department of social life is secured to the ruling class, and the savage dissatisfaction of the more spirited among those who suffer by it.

An unemployed man, exasperated by long privations and indignities, steals a silver cigarette-case on an impulse of drunken spite. The son of a wealthy Member of Parliament is also guilty of a drunken freak—makes off with a harlot's purse. The offences are parallel: but by reason of his fortunate social position the one escapes the consequences of his action, the other is convicted and the tragedy involves his family.

Galsworthy has a clear eye for social antagonisms, of which the most irreconcilable is the conflict of interests appearing as the class struggle. He sees that it is not possible to act upon one set of principles without coming into collision with men who hold to another. "Our loyalties cut across one another," "To be loyal is not enough," are the themes of his latest play at St. Martin's Theatre.

Though the author was not here treating of the class-war, the first observation can with truth be extended to it. The more steadfastly masters and workmen prosecute their respective interests, the completer the solidarity of each class, the more intense is the hostility between them. Only when classes are merged in the Socialist Commonwealth will such contention disappear. But let no enthusiast deem, therefore, that employers and employed alike are to be enlisted in the cause of its establishment: that the class which fights with advantage, and to which fall the spoils of the contest, will throw down its superior weapons and restore the plunder, with no other inducement than a perception of the excellence of harmony among men. No. The revolution will be achieved, not only without its assistance, but in despite of its utmost opposition.

From time to time good people, grieved

by present misery and impatient for its cure, make a bid for the co-operation of capitalists by endeavouring to formulate a scheme which shall recommend itself to both masters and workers as "a more equitable organisation of social life." Setting aside the impracticability of arbitrarily modifying the capitalist system, and the question of how far anything other than Socialism would prove a remedy for the evils they deplore, what is less possible than at once to satisfy two antagonistic ideas of equity?—the one requiring the recognition of private property in the means of production, and consequently to the wealth produced; the other holding that since labour applied to the earth is the sole source of wealth, those who produce have a common title to the fruits of their labour.

A careful reading of history will show that human societies advance by stages, each one of which is marked by equitable organisation—according to the ideas of the then ruling class, and tyranny—according to the revolutionary class. Once it was the rising capitalists of England who shattered feudalism in what Walton Newbold aptly calls "the great struggle for Right, the Right of Property in Hand and Credit." Next will come the turn of the workers, who will set free for the service of mankind the great powers which capitalism, though it has developed them, cannot profitably employ.

To the working class, then, belongs the mission of putting an end to economic conflict, and so to the hatred and wretchedness which grow from it. With its emancipation the world takes another leap forward. For the worker to be loyal to the aspirations of his class is enough: for devotion to the Socialist ideal is in our day the truest service to the human race.

N. P. M.

AN ECONOMIC CLASS

is being held by

BATTERSEA BRANCH, S.P.G.B.

at

16, Creek Street, York Road, Battersea,

EVERY MONDAY EVENING, at 7.30 p.m.

THE GOOD SHEPHERDS.

The report of the I.L.P. Conference, extending over three copies of the "Labour Leader," contains ample evidence to justify the attitude adopted towards that party by the Socialist Party of Great Britain. As they have done hitherto, when it suited their purpose, the leaders and delegates of the I.L.P. loudly proclaimed themselves Socialists and pioneers of the working-class movement, while the result of their deliberations published as a "new constitution," brands them as confusionists.

The Chairman, Mr. R. C. Wallhead, in his opening remarks said that the Party believed and declared:—

"That for the permanent advantage and improvement of working-class conditions, it is essential for the workers to obtain power in politics. That, it believed, was the first great step towards the establishment of an organised society in which the exploitation of men should end through the possession of the means of wealth production by the people themselves. It has persistently pursued that task until to-day it sees, largely as a result of the pioneer work it has done, the establishment of a political working-class organisation which occupies a position of second place in the country, and is accepted by the opposition leaders as the challenger for the premier place in British politics."

The working-class organisation referred to above is the Labour Party; but how many parliamentary representatives of that Party have fought their elections on the question "of the establishment of an organised society in which the exploitation of men should end through the possession of the means of wealth production by the people themselves?" The truth is that all of them have obtained their seats in the House of Commons by keeping that position in the background, while discussing what they term questions of immediate interest, and advocating all sorts of reforms calculated to patch up capitalism and postpone the establishment of the system they profess to be out for.

Such a party may become dominant in British politics, but will always be powerless to establish Socialism because the votes of the workers are not given to them for that purpose.

It is true that the workers control in politics, in the sense that they have a majority of the total votes; but once they have voted that power, either to Coalitionists, Liberals or Labour Leaders, their control is gone, and the party they vote into

office wields the full power of the State. The workers can only use the power that their number gives them when they consciously organize for a specific object and send their own representatives to the national and local assemblies for the accomplishment of that object.

In his address Mr. Wallhead told the assembled delegates that the main thought he wanted to leave with them was that he believed that in the midst of present doubts and perplexities, all the signs and indications tended to prove that the people were looking for a strong lead. If he is justified in this belief, then there are few signs of the workers controlling in politics. If the workers look for a lead, they merely look for leaders on whom to confer power. Their outlook is the same as it has been since the first Reform Bill; or since 1918, when they allowed the present Coalitionist politicians to lead them, with promises far more alluring than those the Labour Leaders dangle before them to-day.

The whole question of slavery or freedom centres around this point: will the workers continue to allow themselves to be led, or will they direct the affairs of life in their common interest, through representatives selected and appointed by themselves?

They can only do the latter when they are in agreement as to the object of their political activities. The only object, correctly understood, on which all workers could agree is the Socialist object. The establishment of a system of society based on the common ownership and democratic control of all the means of wealth production. This is not the object of the I.L.P., nor is it the object of the Labour Party. The objects of the latter party are too numerous to mention; they consist chiefly of any reforms or palliatives that are likely to be popular with the workers at election times. The I.L.P. declares its objects to be:—

"The communal ownership of land and capital, and the performance, as social functions, of the processes of production, distribution and exchange."

Such an object merely means nationalization and bureaucratic government—in practice, what we see in the Post Office—and is what the I.L.P. has always stood for, as anyone can see by a study of their leading publications. Capital is "wealth used for the production of profit," in other words, wealth used for exploitation. It is absurd,

therefore, to talk of the communal ownership of capital. Whether wealth is held and used in this way by individuals, companies, or governments, the workers are still wage-slaves because they must still sell their labour-power in order to live. The modern processes of exchange, too, is a capitalist institution and implies ownership in the means of life, either by individuals, sections, or bureaucracies; it is, therefore, in flat contradiction to communal ownership.

If this is the object Mr. Wallhead has in view, no wonder he told the conference that:—

"The days of agitation and propaganda are to a certain extent ending, and the task of administration begins. In this work of administration the task of co-ordinating Socialist theory to immediate practical problems will necessarily arise."

He (Wallhead) and the I.L.P. hold out as a promise to the workers, Bureaucratic Government. They see numbers of workers, sick of unemployment and hopeless of the fulfilment of Coalition pledges, nibbling at the bait; but Wallhead is forced to admit, even if they occupy "the premier place in British politics," that all they can do is to co-ordinate Socialist theory to immediate practical problems. Elected by workers who do not understand Socialism, leaders who do understand it could do no more. The task for every Socialist is, therefore, to help in the work of making more Socialists.

F. F.

ON GETTING TIRED.

The story is told of Ibn-As-Sammak, a professional tale teller of Bagdad, that he one day asked his slave girl her opinion of one of his discourses. She replied it would have been good but for its repetitions.

"But," he said, "I use repetitions in order to make those understand who do not."

"Yes," she commented, "and in making those understand who do not, you weary those who do."

I wonder if there are many among our readers, who are weary of our repetitions; weary of seeing the same old tale tricked out in different words; of observing month after month the same old call monotonously sounded:—you know the phrase—"we therefore urge the working class to organise as a class, and capture the political machine, etc., etc." Yes, it's a desperate business, this saying the same thing a hundred ways,

a desperate business, only saved from becoming a weariness to the writers, or degenerating into a jargon, by their varying individualities; by each superimposing whatever he may have of wit, or style, or knowledge, upon the original truth. But after all, what would you! What else is there to do! One cannot tell the truth too often. The Capitalist press is never tired of telling the opposite. Purely as a mechanical task this spectacle filled Carlyle with amazement.

"The most unaccountable of all ready writers," he said, "is the common editor of a daily newspaper. Consider his leading articles; what they treat of; how passably they are done. Straw that has been thrashed a hundred times without wheat—how a man, with merely human faculty, buckles himself nightly with new vigour and interest to this thrashed straw, nightly thrashes it anew, nightly gets up new thunder about it; and so goes on thrashing and thundering for a considerable series of years; this is a fact remaining still to be accounted for in human physiology."

It is indeed a thing to marvel on, particularly when as Carlyle puts it, it is "straw that has been thrashed a hundred times without wheat." Critical readers of our modern Capitalist press, must admit there has been little alteration in that respect since Carlyle's day. When one pauses at the end of a week's, or month's reading of daily newspapers, and endeavours to gather some definite mental picture of the period, it is then one appreciates the absence of "wheat." What screaming posters, what heavy, lurid headlines, what "news," what easily flowing, sweetly reasonable articles. But no wheat. All straw, friends: not a grain of wheat in a thousand tons. The one thing that matters is never mentioned. The fact that you are a slave class, ruled economically and politically by a small parasitic class, is never hinted at, other than in terms of ridicule. The overwhelming fact that you spend the bulk of your waking hours in the service of a master, in return for a pittance is again scarcely mentioned, unless it be to assure you that your poverty is essential to national prosperity. Why national prosperity should involve penury and hardship to those who produce it, is another fact that will elude the crowded columns of the master's press.

It is here the Socialist press enters the field. It endeavours to show that modern Capitalist society is broad, based upon one central fact—the dominance and enslavement of the many by the few. It says further that this enslavement is conserved and continued by the grip of the few upon the machinery of government. It follows with the inevitable conclusion, that if the mass of people want to end their slavery, they must gain control of the machine which holds them down.

This is the Socialist position. Not all of it, but its essence. The reason we have to repeat it many times, is because the bulk of the working class have never heard it, and of those who have, but few are moved to action. At the risk of wearying those who do understand, we have to iterate and reiterate the one central truth that matters. Our task would be easier if those who do understand, in all cases squared their actions with their belief, and did the logical thing—joined the Socialist Party. Socialism is essentially a creed of action. Action, and organised intelligent action at that, is vital to its achievement. And yet, there must be thousands of workers, perfectly convinced of the desirability, and of the inevitability of Socialism, who have never lifted a finger to bring it nearer. This is a greater physiological puzzle than that of Carlyle, and for us even more unfortunate; for though his editors' thrash ever so madly, nothing but straw rewards their efforts, whilst we have a harvest that waits but the labourers. It is these who are weary of our repetitions, but they should reflect, it is they who help to make them necessary. Let them take the first step that renders repetition unnecessary so far as they are concerned. Let them cease to wait for the "other chap" to join, but be guided rather, by logic, and shew the "other chap" that you at least are a logical person.

And there is so much one can do. Get your pal interested. Take him along to our meetings; they are all open to the public. Get him to ask questions. Suggest questions to him. To keep him interested, make him order the *Socialist Standard* regularly. Then start on another pal. Do you know, we owe dozens of members and several branches to chance copies of this journal. That should tell you what to do with the extra copies you buy. But above all, and this is a repetition we insist on, if you are

convinced of the truth of the Socialist position it is your duty to yourself and your class to join the Socialist Party and help to bring it about.

W. T. H.

ON LIBERTY.

Your walk of life does not matter, neither your occupation, social standing, nor domestic circumstances. If your brains are sufficiently developed, your understanding sufficiently large to realise what a hard vigilant taskmaster Liberty is, how it must be won by bitter exertion, deep introspection, subtle selection of essentials, and the most ruthless determination to articulate and to live the essence one discovers to be oneself—then, and not till then, are you individually free.

No wonder so few people are personalities and truly human. It is so much easier to jog along simply on the lines of least resistance, to submit to the general trend without struggle, to allow habits, comfort, laziness or cowardice to hold one down, to be nothing but a reaction to other people's lack of ideas, to say and do what is generally expected, what thousands have said and done before on similar occasions.

After all, only slaves tolerate fetters. Freedom is within the reach of those who will take the trouble to grasp it. But it cannot be bestowed from without, like a diploma or a patent; it must be won from within—and one must feel the power to win it.

Socialism points the way. Economic freedom alone makes individual freedom possible for mankind.

W. J. E.

"HISTORICAL MATERIALISM."

The term "historical materialism" describes that view of the course of history which seeks the ultimate cause and the great moving power of all important historic events in the economic development of Society; in the changes in the modes of production and exchange; in the consequent division of Society into distinct classes and in the struggle of these classes against one another.

"Socialism—Utopian and Scientific."

F. ENGELS.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 3s. 0d.
Six Months, post free... .. 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

JULY

1922

CRITICAL TIMES.

Under the title of "A Call to the Churches," an article appeared in the *Daily News* (19-6-22) from which we learn that "just at this moment the history of international relations is entirely upon a critical chapter." The "international relations" referred to are the tricky, treacherous, and avaricious manipulations of different groups of financial magnates, through the medium of various political and other lackeys, for control of the different markets of the world.

There is another chapter in the social book, however, that is of far more interest and concern to the workers than the one above mentioned; and this chapter is also critical, as witness the following quotation from the article to which we have already referred:—

"The relations between nations are more rather than less strained. Hundreds of millions of money are still being spent upon armaments, while unemployment is widespread, social reform is at a standstill, and in many lands starvation and disease are ripe."

Unemployment, starvation, and disease are indeed widespread. As time passes, this chapter not only appears to become more critical, but even appears to have no end—at least, no improvement in the general situation is in sight. The passing or easing of the crisis is delayed, not by the "failure of

Genoa," as the *Daily News* would have us believe, but by the hothouse-like growth of machinery and processes of production brought forth by the war. In other words, wealth is produced in such abundance that the effective demands are overwhelmed. That there is no shortage of wealth is clearly demonstrated by the rapidity with which new capital is subscribed and over-subscribed whenever shares are advertised for subscription.

The article upon which we are commenting provides a rather humorous thrust at the policy the *Daily News* has been advocating for some time. With much use of fine phrases and lengthy "argument," this paper has frequently sought to prove how advantageous the League of Nations would be. Whole-heartedly it has backed the movement and idolised its founders. Now, however, we read:—

"If before the League is complete a counter league or group of powers is formed sufficiently powerful to be independent of it, then we shall surely have the old balance of power in another shape and the embryo of another world war."

In other words, League or no League, the question of war lies in the hands of the powerful combinations of capitalists. Yet in spite of this, self-appointed "leaders" of the workers declaim eloquently on the necessity of supporting the campaign in favour of this side-tracking idea.

Such Will-o'-th'-wisps are attractive, but they lead to disillusion, disappointment, and apathy. When the workers leave these ideas on one side and stick firmly to the hard facts of life which are constantly forcing themselves upon us for examination and explanation, they will be on the broad highway to a knowledge and understanding of their present condition of slavery.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE

S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1

WHO SHOULD WEAR THE CAP AND BELLS?

To the Editors of the *Socialist Standard*.

DEAR SIRS, — From what I can gather, "J. F." wishes to convey the impression that for once he has succeeded in discarding the somewhat grumpy and miserable aspect of countenance which, it seems to me, must of necessity be associated with a scribe of his ponderous, rather than pondersome, disposition. As to whether the impression, if created, is a true record of the facts, I, for one, do not believe for a moment. It seems to suffice from "J. F.'s" point of view that, when he finds himself in difficulties, all that it is necessary for him to do is to tell his readers that he indulged in a fit of hilarity, which he describes as creating "some job to avoid choking." I have a suspicion that by those means (as well as others) it is calculated that another impression shall be conveyed, and that is—that without accomplishing the task, it shall be made to appear easy and accomplished. "The task" that I am referring to is one that has for its object the meeting of, or dealing with, the points raised in my letter, which I claim have not been even referred to. All such abusive language which questions my "method of discussing Marx" as "genuine" has nothing whatever to do with my letter, and only tends to confuse the issue. "J. F." with the rippling laughter (or it is ripping?) of the brook such as poets describe, goes on laughing and laughing and "choking," and by way of demonstrating this laughter as a fact of great importance, he describes me as being capable of "absurd assumptions," "idiotic interpretations," "blindness," with an additional designation of myself as "a short-sighted and intellectually-limited fanatic." All this, it seems, is of a very cheerful character, so cheerful that one is left to conclude that "J. F." cannot under any circumstances be very terrible, even when he is miserable. He would certainly make a great jester if he would but indulge in the cult just a little more. In any case, he has amply qualified for the cap and bells with which, before proceeding further, I must hasten to award him with all due solemnity. To begin with, "J. F." deals with my question as to whether Lenin "expected a country in a backward condition economically to establish Socialism" as follows: "The answer is Yes! Lenin pro-

claimed the upheaval in 1917 as a 'Socialist Revolution,' even as late as his 'Left Wing Communism' written in 1920."

How simple! This appears to me to be the simplification of simplicity itself. It seems that "J. F." has still a good deal to learn. Why! Even a newly-converted worker to Socialism could tell him that there can be no such thing as a "Socialist Revolution," except in so far as that it is led by Socialists, and in this sense the Russian Revolution of November was certainly a Socialist Revolution, and Lenin was certainly correct when in that sense he described it as such. How could a Socialist Revolution be otherwise? If we define the word "revolution" as meaning a complete change, and as a "complete change" such as, say, our present social system from primitive Communism cannot, by any stretch of the imagination be described as a "revolution," but which can rather be described as a complete change brought about through the evolutionary processes of the tools and implements of wealth production, in what other way can we describe a complete change in society as constituting a revolution? It appears to me that "J. F." expects to wake up one fine morning at, say, 6 o'clock (preferably Monday, as we are all in the habit of starting fresh on that day) and witness the most agreeable spectacle of the present system of society being transformed by 9 o'clock into the Socialist Co-operative Commonwealth, all ready for him to start work in the new order of things. I have heard a lot of chatter and fine distinctions made concerning "political," "social," and other revolutions, and "J. F." is apparently one of those who indulges in them; but in so far as the existence of classes is a feature of our social system, the only thing that can be described as a "social" revolution is when a subject class attains to the position of a ruling class, and only in so far as that revolution is led by Socialists, or undertaken by the masses converted to Socialism, can that revolution be described as a "Socialist Revolution." Lenin was, therefore, right when he described the November Revolution as such. That does not mean that he expected "a country in a backward condition economically to establish Socialism." "J. F." in that respect utterly ignores my statement which says that "again and again did Lenin assert the necessity for the economic development of Russia as being requisite

for the establishment of Socialism." Then "J. F.," with a grand flourish of his pen, and, it seems, of trumpets, with all the hilarity and glee that he can muster, proceeds with this revelation: "It is true that later Lenin had to modify his own words, as he has had to do on many other points. But that hits Lenin and Dight—not us."

What words of Lenin did he (Lenin) have to modify? That it (the Russian) was a "Socialist Revolution?" He never "modified" that. That he, with others, established Socialism in Russia, or that he "expected a country in *backward condition economically* to establish Socialism? (Italics mine.) He never said that Socialism was established, and he could never "modify" expectations he never had. It must have been a most inspiring brain wave which "J. F." must have become possessed of when he referred to what he calls the modification of Lenin's "own words" as hitting "Lenin and Dight—not us." This—coupling of my name with Lenin—is deserving of scorn, and, for my part, I can do no more than say that had the coupling been contrived by some other individual intellectually greater than "J. F." and providing that that individual was not indulging in the congenial pastime of "leg-pulling," I *might* have felt highly honoured. As it is, I feel bound to suspect that the methods employed in this respect are calculated to disparage the intellectual qualifications of a man—in the person of Lenin—as compared with whom the greatest "intellectual giant" of the S.P.G.B. can be likened to a jackass. Of course, the "modification" of Lenin's "own words," which, according to "J. F.," mean that the Russian Revolution was not a "Socialist Revolution," does not hit "J. F." or the members of the S.P.G.B. Judging by previous issues of the *Socialist Standard* that is quite true. On the contrary, you do not even regard this fact with any lack of concern or indifference, but rather does it seem to be regarded with gloating joy such as the myrmidons of the capitalist Press might envy. It is quite true that "any elementary school child can answer the question about America." (My italics.) It is likewise quite true that any school child can tell us that the weather is either fine or nasty in accordance with circumstances. But what has all this to do with the question at issue? No one asked any "question" as to what it was that prevented America from

passing through feudalism, except in so far as that an answer was expected in relation to the point at issue. The thing I was concerned with was *the fact* that America adopted capitalism without necessarily going through feudalism. That fact is admitted. And then it wasn't a "question" of America except in so far as that that country served as a means for illustrating my point—a point made quite clear and utterly ignored—and that was *that a country need not go through all the phases of a former system* before another system is adopted, as well as that it need not even go through the system itself—that is, of course, the system which *generally* precedes the system adopted. So far it will be seen by any except those who are afflicted with "blindness" that "J. F." has been indulging in a lot of shuffling and confusion, and where he at all comes to the real question at issue, he uses *four* words, not connected, out of a passage originally quoted by yourselves, comprising no fewer than eighty-two words. It is true that later he uses two sentences torn from their context, and in that way distorting their meaning. Concerning, first of all, the "four words" above referred to, "J. F." says that Marx—

"was dealing with the 'normal development' of societies and how they cannot evade the 'successive phases' of this 'normal development,'"

and that he (Marx) was not dealing, as was my contention, with the "successive phases" and "normal development" of a "revolutionary period." This is clearly a case of "J. F." supposing, to use his own words, that "Marx meant something quite contrary to what he wrote," as I shall show. What is it to which Marx referred when he said that we could not "clear by bold leaps or remove by legal enactments the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development" except a revolutionary period? That it was a revolutionary period to which he referred is clearly proved by the following words from the same passage, to which I drew attention in my letter, and which "J. F." finds it very convenient to ignore: "And even when a society *has got upon the right track* for the discovery of the natural laws of its movement." (My italics.) Then follow the words, some of which "J. F." only uses, which tells us what under the circumstances *cannot* be done; and then Marx says: "But IT CAN shorten and

lessen the BIRTH PANGS." Is it necessary to labour the point further? Anyone with little more intelligence than an idiot can understand that there can be no such thing as social "birth pangs" except within a revolutionary period. Your whole point in your original quotation was to prove that "a country in a backward condition economically" (your words) could not establish Socialism without first going through the "successive phases of its normal development" (Marx), and that Marx "expressly denied *such a thing possible*." (Your words, my italics.) But if we take the thirty-seven words that "J. F." sees fit to use only, from a quotation from the preface to the second Russian edition of the *Communist Manifesto* containing about 300 words, there we shall see that not only is it not true that Marx "expressly denied," etc., but that he, with Engels, asserted the very reverse. Anyone who has read my letter carefully, and closely followed "J. F.'s" "reply," will see that it would be necessary in order that the issue may be cleared to make my original points and quotations, and, as under the circumstances, this task would grow if the matter is pursued further, I think it would be better to terminate this discussion (if such from "J. F.'s" side it can be called), unless some other person takes up the case. It may not even then be necessary to pursue the matter. That depends, of course, upon whether, if after an attempt has been made to meet my case, I consider my position nevertheless established. I had no idea when I wrote in criticism of an editorial that a "reply" was forthcoming from "J. F.," otherwise I doubt if I would have written. I say this as a result of past experience, which is one of abuse, confusion, and shuffle.—Yours faithfully,

HY. DIGHT.

Mr. Dight—to use a phrase popular in the workshop—is unlucky. Along with many other people, whose knowledge of Marx's writings and sociology is small, he was carried away by the upheaval in Russia.

To these people that event was the coming of the promised heaven and Lenin was the "Jesus Christ" of the new Revelation. As sheep-like in their following of Lenin as the Christians were of Jesus they accepted and repeated, without the slightest examination, any statement coming from the new

Messiah. Sometimes this had awkward consequences for the disciples.

Thus in a former communication Mr. Dight tried to use against us a falsification of Marx by Lenin. Our exposure of this piece of fraud was intensely disagreeable for Mr. Dight, as shown by his shuffle of a reply. But it taught him one lesson—namely—that if he wished to quote Marx in controversy with us it was necessary to read Marx himself and not to rely upon Lenin for his quotations. Still even to read Marx does not necessarily guarantee an understanding of what he wrote.

An instance of this was given in Mr. Dight's letter in the May issue of the *Socialist Standard*, where it was easily shown that the quotations given were in direct opposition to the views they were used to support. All Mr. Dight can do, when these facts were pointed out, is to indulge in a long tirade of personalities about "J. F.," to whom he offers the cap and bells. "J. F.," however, has no wish to deprive Mr. Dight of his eminently suitable equipment.

To what a maze of confusion and contradiction hero-worship leads is shown in Mr. Dight's attempt to defend Lenin's false claims of the upheaval in Russia being a "Socialist Revolution." At one part he says:—

"There can be no such thing as a 'Socialist Revolution,' except in so far as that it is *led by Socialists*." (Italics ours.)

This phrase displays an appalling ignorance of the first elements of Socialism and an entire lack of knowledge of social evolution, which is further emphasized by his remarks a little further on when he states:—

"A 'complete change,' such as, say, our present social system from Primitive Communism cannot by any stretch of the imagination be described as a 'revolution.'"

No! it can better be described as the product of a particularly uninstructed mind, for even the school books provided by the capitalist class for workers' children admit the existence of two other systems—chattel slavery and feudalism—between primitive Communism and Capitalism!

Before a Socialist revolution can take place a majority of the working class must understand and accept the essentials of Socialism and organise to establish it. This understanding not only renders "leaders"

unnecessary, it forbids their existence. The working class will keep control in its own hands and administrators will have to carry out the workers' instructions. To talk of a "Socialist Revolution" as being "led by Socialists" is at once to proclaim one's entire ignorance of even the elements of Socialism. It is therefore not so surprising to find Mr. Dight is unable to see the glaring contradictions of his attempted defence of Lenin when he states:—

"Lenin was, therefore, right when he described the November Revolution as such" [i.e., as a Socialist Revolution] and then says:—"Again and again did Lenin assert the necessity for the economic development of Russia as being requisite for the establishment of Socialism."

When is a Socialist Revolution not a Socialist Revolution? When it occurs in Russia!

If it was a "Socialist Revolution" how was it that it failed to establish Socialism? And if it failed to establish Socialism how could it be a "Socialist" Revolution? Such is the result of following "leaders."

Mr. Dight agrees that any school child could answer his question on America—though he was unable to answer it—but now states that he did not put the question "except in relation to the point at issue"—which was exactly why we dealt with it. So to clarify the issue he puts the question again, because we "utterly ignored" it before—by answering it. He repeats his previous point as follows:—

"A country need not go through all the phases of a former system before another system is adopted."

As "evidence" for this entirely inaccurate assertion he pointed to America. We showed how ridiculous this illustration was and Mr. Dight admitted our point, and then repeats his stupid assertion. He has not yet learnt the difference between a country in the geographical sense and the people who inhabit such a territory. A society is formed of the people in a particular country or countries. As pointed out in our previous reply the people of America did not adopt Capitalism. They were exterminated by the people of another country who had adopted Capitalism after passing through Feudalism, and who merely extended their own system into the new area. To put the point more fully—there is no race or nation of people who have passed from either Barbarism or Chattel-slavery

into Capitalism without developing through Feudalism. There is no race or nation of people that have passed from Feudalism to fully developed Capitalism without going through the essential phases of Capitalist development.

On the matter of the quotations from the preface to "Capital," Mr. Dight adopts the well-worn subterfuge of using emphasis for argument. First he put certain phrases in italics. Then, after it was shown that the phrases contradicted his assertions, he tries to make a show of a case by repeating the phrases in capital letters. Unfortunately for Mr. Dight the truth of a statement does not depend upon the type used to print it, but we are inclined to agree with his remark that:—

"Anyone with little more intelligence than an idiot can understand that there can be no such thing as social 'birth pangs,' except within a revolutionary period."

for even he appears to understand the phrase. Where his understanding fails is in not seeing that the "successive phases of its normal development" of any society precedes the "birth pangs" of a new order and is not, as he imagines, contemporary with it.

We also agree that the words Mr. Dight italicised in his quotation from the preface to the 2nd Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto completely knocked out the interpretation he tried to place upon them, and flatly contradicts his present statement that Marx and Engels "asserted the very reverse." Perhaps he was wise not to restate this quotation, seeing that those he has requested have merely exposed further his mental confusion and lack of knowledge. Nor would we deny that his past experience has been one of abuse, confusion and shuffle in face of the strong corroboration of these points to be found in his letters.

J. F.

"Systematization is the essence and the general expression of the aggregate of science. The practical result of all theory is to acquaint us with the system and method of its practice and thus to enable us to act in the world with a reasonable certainty of success.

"JOSEPH DIETZGEN."

HELP TO SAVE.

We have frequently drawn the attention of members of the working class, through our literature and from the platform, that, with the introduction of new machinery, the capitalist class are able to extract more wealth from the workers. The latest device of this character which the capitalist has obtained a monopoly of, is called a "Flapper." It is an attractive looking machine, and has become very popular amongst members of the working class. So whenever the capitalists want to "Raise the wind" for the purpose of maintaining some of those institutions which are necessary under capitalism, such as Hospitals, Orphan Homes, Churches or Famine Funds, they have only to set a few "Flappers" in motion and the trick is done.

At the present time the SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain is in URGENT NEED of FUNDS for the purpose of carrying on our propaganda, including the publication of the "SOCIALIST STANDARD" (which is being sold at a loss) and some new pamphlets which we are anxious to publish as soon as we can obtain the needful. Having no "Flappers" at our disposal, we have to fall back upon the goodwill and intelligence of our readers and also those sympathisers who wish us to carry on the work for SOCIALISM. WE THEREFORE APPEAL to ALL THOSE PERSONS WHO DESIRE TO SEE THE KNOWLEDGE OF SOCIALISM SPREAD FAR and WIDE, to assist us by sending a DONATION (however small or large) to 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1.

£1,000 FUND.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Already Acknowledged	810	13	3½
Donations:—						
W. Ham Branch	..	5	0	0		
Hackney (2)	..	4	0	0		
"C.W.P." San Francisco	..	10	0			
"J.D." Burton-on-Trent	..	2	3			
"D.F."	..	5	0	0		
F.G., New Zealand	..	4	6			
				14	16	9
Stamp Books:—						
N.W.L. (14)	..	1	0	0		
Tottenham (10)	..	4	0			
" (11)	..	2	6			
Battersea (49)	..	10	0			
Watford (28)	..	10	0			
				2	6	6
				£827	16	6½

19:6:22/A.S.C.

SOME SHODDY THOUGHTS OF A SUPERFICIAL MIND.

It is G. K. Chesterton's opinion that Mr. A. J. Pentty is "one of the two or three truly original minds of the modern world." When therefore Pentty applies himself to criticism of Marx one expects something brilliant. It turns out however to be as shallow as any of the stuff written by numbers of critics who make no claim to genius, and the original mind appears to be just like an ordinary one.

Writing on "Christian Communists" in the "Crusader" (26 May, 1922) he begins well with the confident assertion that "there is nothing in common between the Communism of Christianity and the Communism of Marx but a name which conceals differences that are fundamental." This is a refreshing change from the attitude of the discontented religionists who "sympathise with the Labour movement" on the one hand, and from the foggiest of the half-converted Communists on the other. The former fancy they see in the working class movement a blind groping heavenwards, and encourage the view, very useful to the capitalist class, that a little more soulfulness and a little less grasping after material things will right all wrongs, and incidentally make the movement fit for Christians to live on.

Just as the churches are learning that it does not pay to drive away its congregation by too forcible opposition to trade unionism, and safe enough to give benediction to sane Labour Leaders, so also may self-styled Communists recognise the advisability of turning a blind eye on the implications of their own teaching when applied to religious superstitions. Thus we have the "Workers Dreadnought" (4th June, 1921) agreeing with the Rev. Conrad Noel that the true interpretation of "the teaching of the Nazarene is Communism" and that Christ, if he really did exist, "was a Communist without doubt." Again, Francis Meynell, as Editor of the "Communist," while admitting in a letter to an enquirer (2nd June, 1921) that the "materialist conception of History . . . cannot be reconciled with any form of supernatural belief" had to excuse the unsound and illogical attitude of the Communist Party with the evasive remark that the logical proletarian "is even more rare than a white

blackbird"; the specious apology of every purveyor of quack nostrums. If the public doesn't know and doesn't like what is good then give them what they like even though it is bad. If the workers don't like the correct attitude toward religion, suppress it; if they don't like Communism give them something else. In what other way can a "mass" party be built up?

But although Penty recognises the impossibility of reconciling Christianity with Marxism, he soon shows that his knowledge of the latter is hardly sufficient to support the emphatic opinion he expresses.

He says of Marxians that "in practice, as the Bolshevik régime demonstrated, they are Industrial Conscriptionists; for there is no avoiding the conclusion that Marxism leads as inevitably to the servile state as Fabianism." He assumes that his conclusion is so obvious as not to need proof: but is it? If the Bolsheviks made the mistake of thinking that Russian conditions would permit the establishment of Socialism, does this make Marxists responsible for policies imposed on the Bolsheviks by economic necessity? If the Bolshevik Government, acting at the outset with insufficient knowledge of the world situation, were compelled by the failure of their hopes and the critical position in which they found themselves to adopt emergency measures, does this make Marxists Industrial Conscriptionists?

To hold Marxists responsible for the Russian Government's actions is absurd: the Bolsheviks themselves are hardly responsible. They are only taking Hobson's choice.

Penty goes on in similar strain to accuse Marxists of objecting not to capitalism but to the "private ownership" of capital. For proof he refers to, but does not quote, Lenin's speeches. That Marx advocated state ownership is untrue and the suggestion from one who could so easily find out what he did advocate somewhat childish. It is doubtful too, whether Penty *could* produce evidence from Lenin's speeches. That Lenin states as a fact that Russia cannot escape the capitalist stage of development is not a sufficient reason for the assumption that he desires nothing else.

It may be said in his defence by those who have high opinions of Mr. Penty that the "original mind" does not have to trouble about evidence for charges made, but those who don't know Mr. Penty will only notice that this particular controversial

trick is played by so many ordinary people—dishonest people.

I would certainly like to know one thing from Mr. Penty: that is, from what source he learned that Marx "did not propose to abolish capitalism but to superimpose communism over it."

Mr. Penty evidently extends his originality to his use of the King's English, for we are told that Marxians "do not quarrel with modernism as a conception of life, but only with the fact that it is limited to the few." I can only speak for myself but I cannot imagine Marxists quarreling with anybody because "Modernism as a conception of life" is "limited to the few." I don't know what it means but I should be prepared to take the risk and let the few keep it and wish them jolly good luck as well.

Mr. Penty next tells us that Marxians quarrel with the implications of materialism, but not with materialism itself. He omits however to say what the implications are and again leaves me in the dark as to his meaning.

He attempts to state the Marxian theory of social revolution and succeeds well enough while closely following the original, but once he leaves the book and begins to comment, his failure to understand becomes apparent.

He says that "if the forms of social organisation were nothing more than the reflex action of the forces of production, then the millenium ought to arrive by an automatic process without any conscious effort on the part of man." I don't know how "the forms of social organisation" can be the "reflex action" of anything, but assuming Mr. Penty meant something else, I am at a loss to understand where he obtained this notion of Marxism. He then pretends that this difficulty of his own creation was likewise discovered by Marx. "But Marx felt instinctively that such could not be the case." This is another quite common trick.

Penty foists on Marx something he did not say and then argues that because Marx really did say something different that he was either contradicting himself or had changed his mind.

Now having initially misrepresented Marx and started him out on a course which has existence only in Penty's fertile brain, this has somehow or other to be sustained.

He pretends that Marx had to find some driving force, and having cut out love, "he was driven to make use of the power of hatred. Hence the advocacy of the Class War by which he hoped to generate a force capable of overthrowing the existing order of society."

This is sheer nonsense. Marx did not and Marxists do not "advocate class war." Marx from a careful study of the capitalist organisation of society made certain generalisations as to its structure and the lines of its growth and decay. He gave the explanation of its origin and of its position in the chain of social systems, and it is the aim of Marxists to spread this knowledge among the workers in order that it may be the means of hastening the overthrow of capitalist domination. Foremost in this is the recognition of the fact that capitalist society takes its form from the fundamental division into the owners of the means of production, and the wage earners who work but do not own. The Socialist no more advocates class war than does a doctor spread disease who asks that its existence shall be recognised and its nature studied as a prelude to its removal. While disease, physical and mental, was regarded as a punishment for sins, no headway could be expected in the treatment of lunacy or epidemics; while the criminal is regarded as a conscious and deliberate enemy of society instead of a product of the system no headway will be made in the removal of crime. While the class nature of capitalism is unrecognised by the workers, its abolition cannot be hoped for.

Those who endeavour to gain recognition for the fact that class struggle exists, are accused by Penty of fermenting hatred just as those who urged the development of medical and sanitary sciences were accused of encouraging immorality, and those who urged the study of criminology, of fostering crime.

Those who have knowledge of the structure of capitalism based as it is on exploitation, and of the possibility of its replacement by a society in which class divisions shall no longer hamper the use by all of the natural resources and the highly developed means of wealth production, have no need of hatred as a motive force. Knowledge is a much more potent weapon in the hands of the organised working class.

Since therefore Marx did not advocate class war and did not expect that he through

class hatred would generate a force capable of "overthrowing the existing social order" (by the way Mr. Penty has just told us that Marx did not aim at overthrowing capitalism) it is hard to see how Marxians could be disappointed because "it does not work out as expected." Again, "working class solidarity" has never been a reality and could not therefore, owing to the alleged instruction of the workers in suspicion have become a "myth."

It would finally be interesting to know the identity of the "middle class socialists" who, through suspicion of their genuineness, have been lost to the working class movement to the latter's detriment. I know of none. I have heard of people who have made the workers stepping stones to their own advancement, and then to conceal their own meanness when they deserted those who had provided means to their ascent, had to make pretence of being martyrs to suspicion. Penty may mean these, but their value is open to doubt anyway. Their contempt for the workers appears to have been developed more or less consciously, but Penty's judging by the careless and misleading views he gives to his Crusader readers seems to be real; doubtless another attribute of the original mind.

In view of Penty's rather miserable show it would be helpful if G. K. Chesterton would give us the identity of the *third* original mind so that we may know his calibre too.

Chesterton we know. He finds his vocation in writing excellent drinking songs; Penty, with his fine vein of imagination, and his lofty disregard for mere commonplace accuracy should transfer his talent to new fields. He might try Romantic Ballads on other historical figures, preferably those legendary ones about whom no awkward records exist. Anyway he might leave Marx alone.

H.

ATTENTION!

Will those interested in the work of the Edinburgh Branch of the Party communicate with:—

ANDREW PORTER,

12a, Kings Road,

Portobello.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Mathe-w-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spiceal-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

DEPTFORD.—Sec., J. Veasey, 24, Marlton-st., E. Greenwich, S.E. 10. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays in month, at 8 o'clock, at 435, New Cross-rd., S.E. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Andrew Porter, 12a, Kings-rd., Portobello.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at The Arcadians, 42, Amburst-rd., Hackney Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 3, Lyveden-rd., Tooting, S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays, at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 19, Beechfield-rd., Finsbury Pk., N.4. Branch meets Fridays, The Trades Hall, 7, Bruce-grove, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN. Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 6 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 5.30 p.m.
Manor Park, Earl of Essex, 7.30 p.m.
Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 a.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m.
Walthamstow, Hoe Street Station, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.
Tottenham, Junction Clyde-road and Phillip-lane, 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.

**THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.****OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 216. VOL. 18.]

LONDON, AUGUST, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

THE PROBLEM OF THE LABOUR LEADER.

Working class organisations have always (but especially during and since the war) suffered from acts of treachery committed by leaders in whom confidence had mistakenly been placed. Hardly a strike or lock-out of considerable size occurs but there is some Trade Union official who, from sincere or other motives, deserts, or counsels action useful only to the other side. Each of these defections raises a little storm of protest and much vowing of "never again" among the active rank and filers; but the storm dies away, the incident is soon forgotten, and "Black Friday" of 1921 is followed as a matter of course by the engineers' "betrayal" of 1922. On such occasions some band of enthusiasts with its own pet theoretical obsession is sure to offer its explanations and warnings, confident that the workers will this time learn by experience, and that the mistake really will be the last.

If the leader is a "politician," then the anti-political syndicalists will preach about the demoralising influence of the House of Commons, the futility of the ballot, and the necessity for pure and simple unionism of some brand or another. If he is the official of a Trade Union, then reformist political bodies of all shades will point to the narrow, conservative, unidealistic tendencies of union officialdom, and disappointed seekers after his and other jobs will run campaigns to "sack the lot," and perhaps try to stir up the desired amount of feeling by urging that it is the excessive salaries paid which cause indifference to the interests of the under dog—the member.

If the leader still has the ear of his members, he remains where he is, and the thing dies a natural death. If he falls, a grateful capitalist Government may make a niche for him in some obscure department where no harm can be done by his probable incompetency. His successful rival will then take his place, on making all the old unfailingly attractive but never to be fulfilled promises, until he, too, makes way for a new idol; just like the usual ins and outs of national politics.

Of course, new times bring new types, and the Victorian "ploughboy who has fought his way upwards" à la Samuel Smiles gives way to the product of some Labour College or to the University-trained son of one of the old successfuls; but the result is the same. The loving shepherds continue to lead, and the sheep to follow, to the slaughter prepared by the butchers of the ruling class.

What is to be done about it? The matter is an important one, and it is worth while examining some of the proposals made by would-be guides of the workers.

A good instance of the kind of argument used against back-sliding union officials is contained in a resolution of the Distributive Group of the Manchester and Salford Trades Council, reproduced in *The Communist* (10th June, 1922). It urges among other things, that "the salaries paid to whole-time officials should be made to approximate to the average wage or salary obtaining in the industry in which the officials is engaged."

At first glance, this sounds both reasonable and very much to be desired, but is, in fact, quite impracticable. It is the product

not of thought, but of the feeling of resentment against the individuals supposed to be the cause of failure. Because there does not appear to be any justification for the official in a comparatively secure position receiving many times as much as his members, these enthusiasts suggest equalising the two rates of pay as a remedy. They forget to ask themselves whether it will work; they overlook the fact that they live in a capitalist world.

The question of reasonableness is relatively a minor one, and can soon be disposed of. If it is unreasonable that J. H. Thomas should get £1,000 per annum and his members only £150 or thereabouts, is it any more reasonable that a general secretary of a labourers' union with membership running into hundreds of thousands should get about 40s. per week, while an official of an organisation of bank employees, for instance, with less arduous work and less responsibility, gets £500 a year or more? The argument is unsound.

Realising that this is the position, one must give up Utopian notions about equal pay, and look elsewhere for a solution of the problem which confronts us. We need not, of course, accept Clynes's argument in favour of still higher pay, which is that the higher the status of the workers' representatives the more attention conceded to them by the other side. Mr. Clynes knows well enough that other factors determine the amount of consideration an organisation will get from its opponents; will decide, in fact, whether negotiations shall take place at all. When the devil of necessity compels, the robber aristocracy of allied capital does not refuse the "bloody hand" of the saddler President of Germany or of the Bolsheviks.

Another suggestion to the same end was that "every official should be equipped with a thorough knowledge of Economics and Industrial History from the working class standpoint." It would obviously be to the good that the servants of the workers should be competent servants, but if the intended servants are really aiming at being masters, the greater their knowledge the greater their danger. Surely the ambitions of many of the young bloods of the Labour movement, coming barrister Hodges and the products of Fabian training, for instance, are illustrations enough of this.

Where these qualifications already exist the same difficulties are present also. Even the officials of the Communist Party "want

watching." John Clarke, in *The Worker* (organ of the R.I.L.U., 10th June, 1922) writes of the possible danger of the "mass" party (C.P.G.B.) becoming merely a means of collecting "flats" for "the 'communist' amateur Horatio to play with and prey upon."

More than competency is required.

Then there is the talk about demoralising environment, especially of the House of Commons. This is all nonsense. The House of Commons' smoking-room, or wherever it is the Labour M.P.s get drunk, is from a political point of view no more demoralising than the average Labour Party or Trade Union branch or the 1917 Club, where Labour's Hampstead "Highbrows" congregate.

It is based on the assumption that these men rise to eminence because they are revolutionary, and that once arrived their revolutionary outlook gets blurred. The assumption is not correct. Whether or not a few, or all of them, at some time accepted the revolutionary position, they rise because they are smooth-tongued and popular; because they give attractive expression to the momentary discontent of their fellows; because they are quick to note and adapt themselves to coming changes of sentiment, thus gaining a reputation for leadership. It may often be that the successful man is a "rebel," who gains popularity from the prevailing dissatisfaction by the vigour of his abuse of the capitalist, or of the reactionary officials; but apart from the fact that one does not become a revolutionary by composing hymns of hate about the F.B.I., it is obvious that if the workers who originally elected Mr. Clynes to the House of Commons did so because he was a revolutionary, they would not tolerate him when he ceased to be one.

Only a Socialist electorate would support a candidate who fought on a straight Socialist programme, and only a convinced revolutionary membership would have a revolutionary policy and revolutionary officials. This is at the bottom of the business, and it is of no use complaining about the man. What, after all, is the position of the Labour M.P.?

He is elected with the indispensable financial and organisational backing of a Trade Union or the Labour Party, on that nebulous thing—the Labour Party's programme. That is to say, he receives the votes of

people who variously think that "Mr. Shortt must go" for not saving Jacoby from hanging and thus condemning him to the worse horror of life-long imprisonment; that Winston Churchill is a blackguard; that the cattle embargo should be raised; that the beer tax should be removed; that prohibition is (or is not) desirable; that interest on Government Loans should (or should not) be reduced; that this country ought to disarm, or ought alternatively to arm more to make work at Woolwich Arsenal, etc., etc. He receives the votes of a number of shades of anti-Liberal and anti-Coalitionist but decidedly anti-Socialist electors. He gets his £400, with probably some other pay from a Union and almost certainly quite considerable extras in the shape of expenses from various sources. He has no doubt a better and more comfortable existence than previously, and naturally he doesn't relish a return to the insecurity of the mine or the factory. How, then, can he best achieve security? By exposing the rottenness of Labour representation and the futility of Parliamentary bargaining? By offending the powers that be who can offer honours and other more lucrative posts? Not much!

He knows he cannot fight an election on his own, and he knows he must please his electorate and the Labour Party, which can only be done by pretending to fight for the futile reforms on which he was elected, and by supporting new stunts as they become popular. If he doesn't, what happens? Where would Clynes be at the next election if he seriously opposed and exposed the capitalist system? What will happen to Col. Malone, elected as Coalition Liberal, and now in the Communist Party? (Not that I accuse him of seriously opposing capitalism.)

Labour M.P.s and T.U. officials play for safety, and the mentality of the average worker being what it is, this means playing the capitalist game.

This, of course, runs counter to the Communist notion of leadership. I should have said *notions*, because there are two. One is that the workers are really advanced, and willing to fight, but are held back by their timid or treacherous leaders; and the other is that the workers as a whole don't, and won't ever, understand their own interests, but that a choice band of gallant Communists will wrest control from the present leaders and inaugurate the revolution in a

moment of crisis. These words about the moment of crisis serve the same purpose as the indefiniteness of Old Moore's prophecies—they save the prophets from being called to account. Whenever they promise but fail to produce the revolution, they can point out that the crisis wasn't critical enough. That, however, is by the way.

The first I really can't take seriously. The idea of several hundred thousand revolutionary railwaymen, for instance, held in check by J. H. Thomas, only makes me laugh. In the other Communist theory of leadership of the masses we get one of the basic fallacies at the back of the failure of the Labour Movement. Even if it were true that masses of people can be induced to take important action vitally affecting themselves and lasting over a considerable period, merely because they trust certain elected or self-appointed leaders, it still remains to be shown how the Labour Party or the Communists could hope to compete with the older parties, possessing as these do unlimited wealth, long experience, and control of Press and pulpit. Actually, people require sooner or later evidence to convince them that the action they are asked to take is sound for them, although, of course, they may, and often do, for a long while misinterpret the evidence. The extreme foolishness of this case is illustrated by a writer in the *Workers' Republic* (Communist Party of Ireland, 3rd June, 1922), who, assuming the possibility of a Socialist revolution in Ireland sometime between the Armistice and now, explains its failure to materialise by the detention of Jim Larkin in America! The idea of a great social movement affecting every detail of the lives of the great majority of the members of society waiting the arrival of one man is absurd, and the situation is made more ironical when we realise that his imprisonment depends on the whim of the Capitalist Government of the United States. The picture of "Saint" James Larkin, Saviour of Ireland, is amusing but no more accurate than that of Lloyd George, winner of the war, or Horatio Bottomley, Empire builder and martyr. Socialism cannot be achieved by leaders. As Trotsky wrote to an American critic, Louis Boudin: "Remember, we are not making the revolution; the revolution is making us."

As happened in Australia recently, a Labour Government in power could not get even the support of its own employees by

promising to resist wage reduction for them and other workers, because of the effectiveness of capitalist Press propaganda in favour of the theory that high wages prevent trade revival. (*Melbourne Socialist*, 17-2-1922.)

The obstacles presented by the untrustworthiness of leaders arises from the composition of the rank and file. No organisation, industrial or political, can be effective except the members are convinced of the correctness of their aims and the necessity for the policy their organisation has adopted. Only if the members have knowledge can they be immune from betrayal at the hands of self-seeking and unscrupulous leaders.

A further clause in the resolution quoted at the beginning of the article which demands "an enlightened and educated membership" is really, therefore, the one which strikes at the root of the evil. When, by the giving of direct or indirect bribes, the capitalist can secure the co-operation of a Henderson, it is not his brains or ability they want. They were buying his power to dragoon his followers. As Sydney Webb says of the Government positions granted to Labour leaders during the war: "These officials were elected in the main, not on personal grounds, but because they represented the Trade Union Movement." ("History of Trade Unions," page 637.) They were the shepherds with fleeces to sell.

When anti-Socialist organisations make such use of Mrs. Snowden's remark that Socialism is "no solution for the unemployed problem" (*Daily Herald*, 31st January, 1922), it is her influence and her reputation which makes the incident harmful. Workers understanding Socialism would not be misled by Henderson, and would never have put Mrs. Snowden in a position of eminence, and their defection, if it took place, would harm no one except those who paid and made a bad bargain.

Class conscious workers would elect M.P.s on a Socialist programme and with a Socialist electorate behind him the man could, and would have to, work for Socialism. If he went over to the ruling class he would lose his seat. The strength of Parliamentary representation is in the knowledge and determination of the electors.

There is one Labour candidate who recognises this, and in so doing makes the most

effective charge against the Labour Party. Fred Henderson, in his "Labour's Case," says: "If the Labour Party is not returned to power with the full strength of a public mandate for the constructive work of bringing in the co-operative Commonwealth, it had better not be returned at all . . . a Labour Government placed in power by any merely reformist impulse of the electors of the country, and therefore without any real power or authority for anything beyond social reformist purposes, would be in a position of hopeless impotence." (Page 19.)

Only those organisations can effectively wage war on capitalism which are composed of members who recognise the class struggle is fundamental; who realise that Socialism is the only hope of the workers, and who know the lines of their struggle, and the result to be achieved by their activities.

H.

£1,000 FUND.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Already Acknowledged	..			827	16	6½
By Donations:—						
C. & G., Islington	1	0	0		
Mrs. Cohen		10	0		
East London Branch	5	0	0		
Islington Branch	1	0	0		
Southend Branch	1	0	0		
"W.F." Islington		10	0		
T. & L. McCarthy		5	0		
"W.H."		3	0		
Baby Joan		2	6		
Rimmer, Com.		5	0		
				9	15	6
By Sale of £1000 Stamps:—						
N.W.L., 15		4	6		
Battersea Branch	1	0	0		
West Ham		1	0		
"		8	0		
Wood Green		5	0		
"		8	6		
G/n, 37		3	6		
				2	10	6
By Sale of Fishing Rod		5	0		
" .. Photos		1	6		
				6	6	
				£840	9	0½

A.S.C./24:7:22

AN ECONOMIC CLASS

is being held by

BATTERSEA BRANCH, S.P.G.B.

at

16, Creek Street, York Road, Battersea,

EVERY MONDAY EVENING, at 7.30 p.m.

WHAT I'VE LACK.

It was the cry of the 'prentice of three and four hundred years ago, selling his master's wares from the shop doorway. I am reminded of it when I pass you, fellow worker, mornings and evenings. In my thoughts I echo the question, and answer it in your name. What do you lack?

Food, plentiful and pure; yet it is you who grow, carry and prepare the delicate meal for the rich man's table. Clothing, adequate and beautiful: though by your toil your master's person is protected and adorned. A dwelling fair and well provided: yet your hands raise palaces and fill them with comfort. Leisure you have not, though your service makes other lives one holiday. Nor travel, though you build planes and ships. Nor peace for your mind to roam and your limbs to rest.

All these you lack, without knowing that you do. Your life wants breadth and depth and height, and you hardly dream that it might be different. Toil is your heritage, you think, and all else your master's.

You are a funny fellow, worker. You take a man and feed him choicely, dress him with splendour, build him a temple, surround him with perfumes and music—and then fall down before him! When he is established above you, complete, you forget that you made the golden image. Subtract all the attributes and ornaments with which you furnished him, and what remains but a shivering and hungry man? I hear you called rapacious, self-seeking; and I see you more generous than Saint Martin, bestowing your whole cloak on the beggar, and content to receive a tattered remnant back again.

Martin Nexö wrote a tale of a Danish workman, Pelle. Did you ever read what he said of us all when he looked at his newborn son? Men, he said, are born naked; the beasts are born clothed. That is because mankind has come to the point where it can provide clothes for itself. Pelle's wife thought Nature might well neglect the rich, but remembering how workers suffer in the bitter weather, she wondered that their children should still come unclothed into the world. For the best of reasons, Pelle thought. It is no longer Nature's business. She has given man the powers; it is for him fitly to employ them. Therefore the cobbler's son, just as the prince, arrives without a wardrobe: "as if," Pelle said,

"Nature were forever holding up to us the stamp of our nobility."

And there he was right. Having learned to produce all things for human sustenance and delight, we have now to see that who produces enjoys. To be robbed is not noble. To be a slave is not noble. The next step, comrade in labour, is clear: and it is we who must take it. The earth, and all means which we have produced for drawing wealth from it, must be ours in common. Why that, you say, is revolution! So it is. Man's advance from the tribal communes has been a succession of revolutions; and each one, by fulfilling the aspirations of a single class, brings mankind farther on its upward way. All classes but ours have won to freedom. the Socialist revolution will be our own. Thereafter, to live one must perform one's share of social effort, and shall lack nothing that human wit can devise and labour produce. N.

"SUCH STUFF AS DREAMS ARE MADE OF."*Is Trade Unionism Sound?*

By J. H. Bunting. Published by Benn Bros. 2s. 6d.

Sir Peter Ryland, who writes one of the prefaces to this book, J. R. Clynes being its other sponsor, is Past-President of the Federation of British Industries. He is also Chairman of Ryland Bros., Ltd., Vice-Chairman of Pearson, Knowles Coal and Iron Co., Ltd., and director of several companies including the London and Lancashire Fire Insurance Co., Ltd., Moss Hall Coal Co., Ltd., Partington Steel and Iron Co., Ltd; quite a captain of industry, in fact, eking out a meagre existence on what our author calls "wages of superintendence." When therefore he closes his blessing on the book with the remark that "some of Mr. Bunting's premises may require further examination before they are completely acceptable," I suspect him of cynicism. Sir Peter must know enough about industry, even if he is a director, to be aware that the less they are examined the more liable are Mr. Bunting's premises to be accepted as the truth. Examination damns the book from first page to last as a mass of economic untruths, confusions, and contradictions. In style and matter it resembles those "Pay-day talks" which nowadays bulk larger and larger in pay envelopes.

It extends to about 100 pages, each one more puerile than the last.

Before dealing with a few of the points it raises there is one small criticism I have to make. The book is entitled "Is Trade Unionism Sound?" Now in a book with this title the reader expects to find something about trade unionism. He expects to have the author's definition of the term set before him, with a survey of trade unionism in the past, and lessons to be drawn from that survey. All this the reader expects reasonably enough, and yet nowhere in this book, save on the flyleaf, do the actual words "trade unionism" occur. Without counting I cannot say how often the phrase "trade union" is used, but certainly not half a dozen times. The author ignores the subject he is supposed to be writing on. He leaves it without apology or excuse and plunges at once into his world of dreams, to preach of brotherhood and good feeling between employers and employees. But let us turn to the material Mr. Bunting offers. From so much that is false it is difficult to choose items for comment. And to show briefly what in Mr. Bunting's opinion is wrong with the world is equally difficult, for he does not definitely tell us. The one thing that certainly is not wrong with it in his opinion is capitalism. As well as I am able to make out Mr. Bunting's case it is this:—

"The total production of industry is the gross production of the workers who out of it have to pay (1) so much for the use of capital; (2) so much for the use of land; (3) so much for the employers' services." (Page 25.) The balance they keep for themselves. This constitutes their wages fund. Now "if the amount of production could be increased, prices would be reduced accordingly, more capital could be conserved, and it would follow that it would be at the disposal of the workers at a lower rate. This would mean that capitalists would receive a smaller proportion of the total production, leaving a larger proportion of the increased production to be shared between the workers." (Page 35.) And how to increase production? Why work for whatever wage an employer will offer? Don't insist on 70s. when only 66s. is tendered. Take 66s., and then you create a demand for 66s. worth of commodities, and thus for workers to produce them, and these workers in their turn create fresh demand for labour and so "ad infinitum." Everyone is

employed, prices fall, real wages rise, the workers continue to pay less and less for the use of capital, until finally "they enjoy its use practically free of charge." (Pages 18 and 29.) What a lovely dream! Only unfortunately it is only a dream, and does not stand examination, Sir Peter!

Even the dreamer himself seems to have doubts about the efficacy of his scheme, for he shows us how it would work if applied on Mars, where, for illustration, he assumes "conditions to be very similar to those which prevail here." Yes; they may be "very similar," but they are not the same, and because of that the scheme will fail here. Even judged by Mr. Bunting's own premises it can be shown to be impossible and illogical.

If the demand for commodities increases to such an enormous extent, why should their prices fall rather than rise, and why should the price of capital (i.e., interest) fall with an increased demand?

But, of course, our author is wrong in his fundamentals. Workers do not "employ capital." The owners of capital employ them. To-day the working class possesses nothing but its power to labour, which, in order to live, it sells to the capitalist class, the owners of the machinery, the raw material—in short, all the means of production. And the capitalist is willing to buy labour power because it brings forth surplus value, because it produces more than is necessary for the workers' subsistence, because he can appropriate to himself this surplus. When a surplus cannot be obtained production ceases, unemployment ensues. The profits of capital, while undoubtedly produced by the workers, are not paid by them to the capitalists for the use of their capital, but are extorted out of them by the present system of legalised robbery.

Until he realises this, our author will continue to contradict himself and argue in circles. And when he does realise it, he will not be so hazy concerning wages, prices, and profits.

Another statement given without the sorely needed proof is the old one that high wages result in high prices. If it is possible for a producer to raise prices at will, if prices are fixed quite arbitrarily, why is any strike ever contested? Why do employers organise to prevent wage increases? It would be cheaper and easier to pay any wage demanded and raise the price of the product. Capitalists

and workers alike are subject to the economic forces which, not individual wishes, determine the prices at which commodities sell. To recount all the other fallacies and sentimentalities contained in the book would take too long, and serve little useful purpose. When an author says that half the reward of a miner "is the vision of the comfort that is being brought to the homes of the people, the power that is being supplied for the production of wealth"; and that capitalists "if they choose to retire from the commercial arena, could obtain sufficient income from their capital without entrenching on their capital or employing labour for commercial purposes" (Marx in "Capital" has already asked: If all capitalists were to do this, where would they find their commodities in the market?)—to quote but two passages typical of many, he is not worthy of serious attention.

But books like these which, whilst ostensibly stating new truths are in reality only propounding new ways of defending capitalism, are becoming more and more common as the rottenness of the present system of production obtrudes itself more on its victims, and unless such attempts are recognised for what they are, still more enquiring workers will be gulled into meek acceptance of their present misery. Knowledge of their position in society will, however, give the workers the power to resist the influence of these pipings, and that knowledge can only be obtained by the reading of Socialist literature and a grasp of the Socialist position.

W. J. R.

THE PIERIAN SPRING.

Addressing an Educational Society meeting in London at the end of March, Lord Haldane, as reported by *The Scotsman*, said that "he did not think we would get a fully intelligent nation and, as a consequence, a fully intelligent Government, until we got the influence of the University student permeating the whole nation. The Universities were to-day rising to a new function. . . . A great change had come over the people. . . . The working classes were becoming keen about the higher knowledge. They thought nothing too difficult to learn, from Einstein downwards." (Downwards to J. S. Nicholson, we presume.) "He saw in the future a class of University

student who would find a career in the missionary effort of going into the industrial centres, and preaching the higher knowledge to the workers. It would be a new kind of work, akin to that of the clergy, but would be pursued from the standpoint of the University."

We like this vision of Lord Haldane's. We like it immensely. We thrill to the thought of the young venturer answering the call: "Come over into Manchester and help us!" We follow him in spirit into the wilds of Barrow and Luton, clad in the decorum of Eights' Week as in a garment, and luminous with Higher Knowledge. Wondrous gospel and full of promise!

What constitutes Higher Knowledge? We do not know. But be sure it embraces whatever concerns the upward march of man. Its apostle will first make known to the workers that there is no longer any reason why they should be starved either of learning or of bread. That without their toil there would be neither for any man. That the whole history of human kind from the first slaves till now is the story of the many, ignorant and meanly provided, serving in different ways the few, privileged to wealth and culture. That they are the last to win their freedom, and when they resolve to produce for themselves, instead of their masters, neither physical or intellectual hunger will go unsatisfied.

Oh, be sure the Higher Knowledge must begin with this—the setting of the workers' feet upon the road to universal culture, the Pierian spring at which all may drink and rejoice—well, perhaps not quite that. "With an educated democracy, such as he had in view, the workers would not only earn better wages, but there would be fewer strikes and lock-outs and disturbances, and the productivity of the nation would increase as the result of its system of higher education."

So the highest blessings of the Higher Knowledge is, after all, only to make more efficient wage-slaves. No, on second thoughts, there will be no reason to abandon socialist teaching even if Lord Haldane's dream shall come true. There will still be need of knowledge, simple and unexalted—knowledge with a small k. A.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 3s. 0d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

AUGUST

1922

THE COMMUNISTS AND IRELAND.

On the front page of "The Communist" (8-7-22) there appears an article entitled "Our Duty to Ireland" that calls for some comment on our part on account of the nonsense contained in it.

The main struggle in Ireland is not, and never has been, a struggle of wage workers against masters. Here and there in the history of Ireland there have been minor struggles on the part of the workers, but the greater part of the stage has always been occupied by the national struggle for freedom of enterprise on the part of the various groups that might benefit by greater freedom to exploit Irish Industry. As Ireland exists principally by agriculture the small farmers or peasants have figured largely in the strife. The fact that the poverty-stricken peasants have borne the bulk of the burden of struggle is no evidence that they will obtain any benefit, whatever be the outcome.

This struggle in Ireland has been going on for centuries, and bitterly indeed have the peasantry suffered by the coercive actions of the foreign land-owning class, who were backed up by the different English Governments.

Irish industry is backward partly on account of the lack of certain economic resources such as coal and iron, partly because it suited Irish landlords and English

capitalists to keep Ireland in the main an agricultural country.

Though the capitalistic development of Ireland has been slow, yet considerable progress has been made in that direction. The wage labouring class has relatively increased and the farmers have come more and more under the control of large industry. The farmers are, in the main, in the hands of the agents of the large exporters—egg buyers, cattle buyers, corn buyers, creameries and so on. The European war made the farmers temporarily well-to-do, and they poured money into the Sein Fein movement in the belief that the latter movement would conserve their prosperity. Peace, however, is bringing them back to the position of paid growers and distributors of agricultural produce.

An Irish Sein Fein Republic will not solve the difficulties of the wage labourers and farmers—it will, in fact, intensify their misery. They will then be under the control of the same people who control affairs now—Irish buyers—Irish Capitalists—without being able to salve their wounds by blaming all their troubles upon the English oppressor.

The way out of the difficulties facing the Irish town and country worker is the same as the way their fellow workers have to follow, no matter what country they chance to exist in. That way is to join with their fellow workers the world over in the struggle to put an end to Capitalism by introducing Socialism. Anything short of this will only bring in its train bitter disillusion. They who tell the Irish workers to organise for anything less than this are their enemies.

Such in brief is the general position. The article mentioned in our opening remarks advises the present minority in Ireland to fight on, and the reason they advance for backing the minority is contained in the following extract:

"De Valera never was, never can be, a leader of the workers. Nevertheless, most of the revolutionary workers are with O'Connor and him.

"They are with them for the same reason that we, if we had to make the choice, would be behind De Valera and O'Connor—because they are fighting the British Empire. (Italics theirs.)

"That reason—no other."

The Communists, therefore, support the minority in Ireland "because they are fighting the British Empire—that reason—no other." What a brilliant attitude for

a self-styled working class party to take up. If they follow this policy out logically (nor that we wish to be accused of suggesting that the Communist can follow anything out logically) then on the same ground they would have been bound to support the Central Powers in the European War, incidentally supporting the oppressors of foreign working men, and the useless slaughter of working men generally. In other words they tie themselves to a policy of supporting the murderous conduct of different groups of foreign capitalists "because they are fighting the British Empire!" A delightful position indeed—but a fitting position for sensational gasbags.

The above is not all—the article concludes as follows:

"Workers of Britain, show these politicians they are wrong.

"You have no cause for quarrel with your oppressed comrades in Ireland. You never had. Whether the present armed conditions in Ireland are prolonged or no."

"Stop making munitions for Ireland! Stop sending munitions to Ireland! Demand the withdrawal of British troops! Do for the Irish what you did for the Russians!" (Italics theirs.)

This is really the most absurd part of all—if one can define one piece of nonsense as more absurd than another. Not many months ago they themselves made the following enlightening observation on "what you did for the Russians."

"Frankly, the National Council of Action has failed, and its failure is all the more disappointing when one remembers the unanimity and enthusiasm of the great Central Hall Conference held at the beginning of August last. It was formed to prevent the supplies and munitions being sent in support of the attack on Soviet Russia, which it is quite obviously not doing. Somehow, and from somewhere in this country, those supplies are being sent.

"A Moscow report alleges that England 'has sent seven steamers of munitions, three tanks, and twelve small steamers with provisions in aid of Poland, and that these have been unloaded at Danzig. German reports refer to foreign vessels passing through the Kiel Canal, presumably to the same direction.'" (The Communist, 7/10/20.)

This is "what you did for the Russians." What blind rhetorical balderdash!

"What you did for the Russians" then was to fail completely to prevent munitions being sent to assist those fighting against Russia. The Communists wish the same policy to be carried out again. Funny, isn't it?

Taking the superficial facts of the situation in Ireland as it is at present concerning

the attitude of the minority, the position is as follows:

The Irish people have voted in favour of the Free State idea by an overwhelming majority. This is the fact that cannot be swept aside by sensational remarks. Consequently, whatever the minority may think of the Free State position, the only sensible course for them to follow is to accept the position the vote of the people has forced upon them for the present, but work to alter the mental outlook of the majority so that future elections will see the Free State position supplanted by the one the present minority favour. To endeavour to alter the views of the mass of the population by battering their heads is a nonsensical attitude to take up. Besides, has not the common cry of Ireland for years been that the majority of the Irish people were being coerced to suit the ideas of a minority?

Whether or not the English Government has bought over the Collins group does not hide the fact that the majority of the Irish population agree to the position Collins has taken up. This should sign "finis" to the matter for the present without further useless throwing away of lives.

It may appear very heroic to fight a losing battle to the end; martyrdom is always a very questionable attitude, though it may be spectacular. In the present circumstances, where it involves the lives of numbers of Irish working people who do not yet understand their social position, it is criminal folly.

Finally, as mentioned above, whatever the immediate outcome of the struggle may be, one thing is certain; it will still leave the Irish workers wage labourers—and that is the essence of the matter for us.

ATTENTION!

Will those interested in the work of the Edinburgh Branch of the Party communicate with:—

ANDREW PORTER,
12a, Kings Road,
Portobello.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

RUSSIAN PROBLEMS.

Dear Sirs,

In reply to Mr. Dight, you mention the fact that the case of America is an example of Capitalist Development by transplanted material. I think that Marx has pointed out that the machinery of Capitalist Production must be used for producing under another state. We know that the Russians have been bargaining for more machinery. Assuming that they are successful, don't you think that we should witness the development of a Proletarian State by transplanted means? I do not think that Marx expected everyone to be capable of fully understanding the anomalies of Capitalism before a revolution occurred.

He states in the preface to the Critique:

"With the change of the economic foundation, the entire super-structure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations, the distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, æsthetic or philosophic, in short, the ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out."

This passage seems to show that Marx foresaw a change from one system to another without the people being educated up to, say, the S. P. G. B. standard. I should like to see your interpretation of it. In other parts of your reply you are inclined to exaggerate. For instance, "As the upheaval in Russia in 1917 scarcely raised a ripple among the workers of the West, and certainly not the faintest suggestion of a revolution." Does the writer remember a person named Liebnicht? Then there is the case of Hungary, Finland, Persia, also, I do not think that the Russians expected to turn the peasant into a Marxist in a single night (although that job with the Bolsheviks in Political Power is far easier than the S. P. G. B. job with the Capitalist holding political power). The people I have met and talked with on their return from Russia have said that the peasant supported the Bolshevik because he gave him land and peace. Then again, if there has been no social change in Russia, would the writer tell me why the capitalist powers of the world have been busy subsidising wars against the Soviet Republic?

Surely if they are going on the same routine as Capitalist Society there is no need to attack them.

Yours fraternally,
D. S. O'MAHONEY.

REPLY TO D. S. MAHONEY.

Our correspondent misses the point of our first reply to H. Dight. In America we have the example of a new people, with new higher developed methods, being transplanted into that country. The introduction of modern machinery into Russia would be of little use unless people capable of manipulating that machinery were also taken there. As a matter of fact the Bolsheviks are trying to do this by endeavouring to establish colonies of American skilled workers to operate up-to-date machinery, which the Bolsheviks know full well the Russians could not operate.

No doubt the Russian Government hopes to use these colonies as training grounds for native workers, but it will take more than a generation to produce even moderately skilled workers from among the Russians, and thus they will still be behind the Western workers in social development and understanding.

Mr. Mahoney does not state what he considers is "the S. P. G. B. standard," but it is as clear as daylight that social ownership of the means of life will not be established until a majority of the workers see the necessity for it by reaching an understanding of their slave position and the method necessary for their emancipation. Until then they will be content to remain slaves as long as an existence of some sort is allowed to them. Nay, more. They will be prepared to fight to defend the system that enslaves them. The passage from the preface to the "Critique" in no way conflicts with this position, and, therefore, does not call for any "interpretation" on the point.

Liebnicht's adventure was not a "revolution," and the attitude of the workers after his death showed how small was his following. The upheavals in Hungary, Persia, etc., were mere political struggles without the slightest effect upon the social structure of those countries.

The last query of our correspondent shows an astounding blindness to the events of the last eight years. Germany and Great

Britain were on the same capitalist basis, and practically at the same level of development, yet they engaged in a colossal war over questions of economic domination, and carried such war on for over four years. European capitalists have subsidised the buccaneering expeditions into Russia as one of the means to obtain control of Russia for the purpose of exploiting the Russian workers themselves.

J. F.

WAS MARX RIGHT?

Dear comrade,

I have had one or two specimen copies of the *Socialist Standard* and have taken an interest in Marx, but having very little knowledge of the position I would be pleased if you would help me in the clearing up of a few points.

(1) Marx lays it down that Capital, as the system develops, becomes concentrated in fewer hands. Is it not a fact that instead of that being the case decentralisation of Capital is taking place on an ever larger and larger scale? And instead of the small man or middle class such as lawyers, doctors, etc., being eliminated they are becoming more numerous?

(2) Marx states that the workers condition under Capitalist must get worse, and that the worker must sink lower and lower in the social scale. Is it not true to say that for the last 30 years the workers condition instead of getting worse has been gradually improving. If these two statements are true, how do you reconcile them with the position of Marx? Should be much obliged if you would supply me with the answers to these questions. I am only seeking for information.

I am,
Yours fraternally,
C. F. BRANSBY.

REPLY TO BRANSBY.

The student of Marx is often astonished at the emptiness of the supposed arguments advanced against the Marxist case. The questions given above are good specimens of these objections, as the following facts shew.

For several years there have been numerous agitations organised in America against the "Trusts," and various methods—all equally futile—have been proposed for

curbing these huge concentrations of wealth. At one period the capitalist press here claimed that such "Trusts" were purely American phenomena, and that they could not exist in "freedom loving Britain." Yet at the time such statements were made Trusts existed here in more than one industry. The Cotton Thread Trust, under the control of J. and P. Coats, and the Tobacco Trust were well known cases. The directors of the various Railway Companies used to meet periodically to arrange fares and rates and so forming a price-fixing ring.

The war increased the speed at which these combinations were formed, and in whatever direction one cares to look now combinations are seen in control. Lever Brothers, Ltd., is a gigantic Soap Trust and it is spreading into the Fish Industry. The armament firms form a big ring and control the battleship building yards. Over 80 per cent. of the banking business is controlled by five Banks, viz., Barclay's Bank, Lloyds Bank, London County Westminster and Parr's Bank, London Joint City and Midland Bank, National Provincial and Union Bank of England. (Wages, Prices and Profits, p. 101).

In 1919 the Government issued a report of a "Committee on Trusts" (Cd. 9,236, price 6d.), which states:—

"We find that there is at the present time in every important branch of industry in the United Kingdom an increasing tendency to the formation of Trade Associations and Combinations."

Some highly interesting information, with curious details, is given in this valuable report, that every critic of Marx should read.

In view of recent developments in the East it may be mentioned that practically the whole of the oil resources of the world is controlled by two immensely wealthy Trusts—The Standard Oil Co. and the Royal Dutch Shell Co.

There is some confusion of thought shewn in referring to lawyers, doctors, etc., as the "middle class." When Marx was dealing with the concentration of wealth, he referred to the small producer or capitalist being crushed out. The lawyers, doctors, and the whole of the professional section live by the sale of their services and are therefore, in the mass, members of the working class. They have increased in numbers due to the greater demand for

trained and technical advisers and managers in the industrial combinations and to the fact that so many small capitalists, seeing the hopelessness of their own position, have had their sons trained for the professions as they believe there is a greater chance of obtaining a livelihood in such directions.

In face of the huge array of facts around us to-day showing the misery of the worker's position, it is remarkable that anyone—not a defender of capitalism—can talk of the workers' position being "improved." The standard of life of the working class has been steadily deteriorating for more than 30 years. Even during the period of the war, when the workers' opportunities of raising wages were greater than at any previous time under capitalism, the wages paid did not keep pace with the increasing cost of living. Since then wages have fallen heavily in all directions, far faster than the cost of living has decreased, so much so that in certain cases, e.g., the coal miners, many of those *in work* have to seek relief from the local Guardians.

But this is not the whole, nor even the main part of the case. First, relative to the amount of wealth produced, the social position of the worker has become much worse. In the middle of the 19th century the millionaire was looked upon as a wonder. To-day the billionaire excites no particular comment. While immense fortunes have been amassed in the hands of the few, the workers are struggling harder than ever to obtain a subsistence.

Second, whether the wages of a particular worker has increased or not the insecurity of his existence has grown by leaps and bounds. No one to-day is sure of his job, no matter how "high" or "low" his status may be. And it is this appalling insecurity of life amidst wealth produced in gigantic quantities that drives the workers down in the social scale as capitalism develops.

Every fact of the workers' position demonstrates the correctness of Marx's great analysis of society, and the path society was bound to follow. J. F.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

AMERICAN RESOURCES.

"This Country (U.S.A.) alone has resources more than sufficient to feed, clothe, and shelter the entire population of all civilised countries. Probably it would not be too strong a statement to say that with our present man-power and material equipment, properly and effectively applied to our natural resources, we could furnish all the principal necessities for the economic support of all the people of the earth for years to come. It has been computed that we have standing room for all the human beings now living, in the State of Texas alone, giving to each individual 66 feet square of space. It has been estimated that California alone could furnish all necessities and many luxuries for one-half the present population of the United States. That section of the country usually referred to as the North-West could feed the present population of United States with the exception of such things as are grown in tropical countries, without any great strain upon its resources, and its surplus will be sufficient to purchase these products. Taken together with the Pacific North-West, it could furnish all the breadstuffs, meat products, dairy and poultry products, wool, flax, shoes, lumber, iron, steel, coal and water power, the entire country could use in the next five hundred years.

"The like could be said of almost any other great sub-division of the United States, yet there are millions in this country to-day who are facing a winter of threatened suffering from exposure and lack of food. At the same time, the farmers of the country have produced so great an excess of food that it cannot be carried over by our transportation, marketing, and credit system and placed in the hands of consumers, even though we have employment at prices within their reach. We have ample resources of coal and other fuel to meet all needs for industrial and domestic uses of our people and more; yet many parts of the country are facing the practical certainty of a fuel famine in case the winter should be severe."

(Senator E. F. LADD, reported in Congressional Record Sixty-Seventh Congress, Second Session, December 15th, 1921. Washington, U.S.A.).

SOME I.L.P. DISTORTIONS OF MARX.

On page 5 of a pamphlet "All about the I.L.P." we read that the I.L.P. "has never formulated its theory of Socialism." In the I.L.P. study course "The Principles of Socialism" we have the theory which the I.L.P. says it had never formulated. If, however, you hastily conclude that its left hand is ignorant of what its right hand is doing you may be wrong. When you read further and learn that the basic principle of I.L.P. doctrine is "the belief that there is in the human soul as such, something precious," you realise that the denial is accurate; the I.L.P. has not formulated a theory of Socialism.

It is true that the I.L.P. has never systematised its propaganda and has been content to allow its members of various shades of political opinion to air their views as the spirit moved; but to suggest that there is some merit in this looseness is to ignore facts. What has actually happened is that the I.L.P. has been used in the main to spread the anti-socialist theories of the Liberal Party. It has, by emphasising those catch-phrases which expressed the earlier revolt of the rising industrial capitalists against the autocracy which hampered them, appealed to the discontent of the working class, without, however, assisting them to understand and solve the problems which faced them in their struggle.

The "Principles of Socialism" contains more positively harmful stuff than one would have thought possible for so slim a booklet, and we will therefore confine our attention to one piece of misrepresentation.

On page 24 we read:—

"... Karl Marx and his followers developed the theory of economic determination. In accordance with this, capitalist exploitation would proceed progressively with the consequent deterioration of the workers, until, at last, the extremity of their despair and a common consciousness of it would cause them to break their chains, which were all that they possessed, and seize possession of the, by then, completed construction of capitalist concentration. Both sides assumed the class war and the continuance of misery in its extreme form. Neither has proved true. There has been a slow amelioration in the condition of even the poorest; and a recognition that whereas Capitalism is based upon classes, Socialism cuts across them. The I.L.P. has always seen that though misery may make Socialists, social progress makes for Socialism, which represents a fulfilment and emancipation not for the proletariat only, but for workers of all grades, whether by hand or brain."

That is the considered opinion of Mary Agnes Hamilton, the mouthpiece of the I.L.P., and I propose to deal with it.

First for the condition of the workers: Mrs. Hamilton says there has been "slow amelioration." She gives no dates, but as concerns the last ten years I think it can be asserted with some confidence that there has been no such amelioration. There is hardly an industry the workers of which do not complain that the increased cost of living has left them poorer than in the years before the war, and with unemployment so widespread and the trade unions so demoralised, it cannot even be said that the future offers hope of their regaining what they have lost. I do know that in America, where statistics have been compiled, the standard of living in 15 chief industries has fallen 25 per cent. in 24 years ("American Economic Review," September, 1921), and that in this country in 1921, according to the "Daily Herald" (7th January, 1922), there were more people (1,519,823) in receipt of poor law relief than at any time during the 72 years for which record is available.

No proof of this amelioration is offered and I see no signs that it is taking place. Furthermore, Mrs. Hamilton has to convince not only me, but also her fellow member, R. C. Wallhead, who, as Chairman of the I.L.P., is reported to have spoken as follows at the Easter, 1922, Conference:—"The conditions of the workers go from bad to worse." . . . "There has been a reduction in wages of the working class of Britain of not less than 400 million pounds a year, and still the insatiable demand continues for more. In addition actual working conditions were again being attacked, and the workers would soon have in their program once more a renewed demand for the eight hour day." ("Daily Herald," 17th April).

So much for the facts.

Now for the theory. Since Mrs. Hamilton evidently assumes facts which will fit her arguments it is not at all surprising that she also invents theories which, with the assistance of her unreliable facts, she can make a pretence of disproving. One wonders though why Marx was introduced into the affair, unless it is because he is so much disliked in the I.L.P. and other Liberal circles in which Mrs. Hamilton moves.

She makes plain by her attempted refutation, her belief that the Marxian theory

which she purported to state, involved acceptance of the idea of increasing poverty for the workers. Let it be noted therefore that Marx did not formulate such a theory, and his explanation of the process of the breakdown of capitalism in no wise depended on a continued worsening of the condition of working class life.

Briefly put, this is the theory:—that there is a tendency to the concentration of the means of wealth production in fewer and fewer hands. That with the increase in powers of production owing to technical improvements, the mass of wealth produced becomes ever larger. That the growing use and higher quality of machinery render the workers ever more redundant, and prevent their obtaining much more than the bare necessities of life. That the share of wealth enjoyed by the workers stands therefore in ever decreasing proportion to the amount produced, with the consequent widening of the gulf which separates the working class from the capitalist class. As a result of these developments the workers, compelled to organise as a class in opposition to their exploiters, will ultimately recognise that their only hope lies in capturing political power in order to destroy the capitalist system of society.

Mrs. Hamilton alters this considerably; fakes her evidence and then triumphantly asserts that Marx and Engels were wrong! What she misunderstands, if, that is, she ever attempted to grasp the theory, is that Marx put the emphasis on the widening of the gulf between the working class and the capitalist class, the worsening of the workers social status relative to that of the employing class, the increasing degree of the workers' exploitation. He expressly excludes the idea of increasing poverty by assuming the continuance of this process, whether wages are high or low.

"It follows therefore, that in proportion as capital accumulates, the lot of the labourer, be his payment high or low, must grow worse." (Page 661; Capital, Vol. I., Swann, Sonnenschein), and again, "Just as little as better clothing, food, and treatment, and a larger peculium, do away with the exploitation of the slave, so little do they set aside that of the wage worker" (page 631).

As for the class struggle, Mrs. Hamilton says that the assumption of its continued existence "has proved untrue." Now she

may (although it is hardly credible) live in such seclusion as to be unaware of familiar evidence of the class struggle; that last year for instance, the miners were locked out and beaten, and that the engineers, who have recently been locked out, were promised all possible support by the I.L.P.; but she cannot be excused for having overlooked what she herself wrote. "The existing system is based on a competition between classes; of which the essential fact is the private ownership by one class of the means of production" (page 8) and on page 9 "So long as Capitalism lasts, no reconciliation of Labour and Capital is possible." The two participants in the struggle, the existence of which has "proved untrue," can never be reconciled!

As a matter of fact it is difficult to find any point on which Mrs. Hamilton is clear. Even her knowledge of the I.L.P. seems to be somewhat shadowy.

She goes on to make a distinction (which she does not attempt to define) between workers and proletarians. A proletarian in the Marxian use is just simply a wage or salary earner; a member of a propertyless class which, in order to live, must sell their energies to the owners of the means of production.

To encourage its members to use a word in any meaning they chose may be a way of giving effect to the I.L.P.'s belief in "Liberty of Conscience," but, even so, it would really be less confusing if this was explained.

Then again, "the I.L.P. has always seen that though misery may make Socialists, social progress makes for Socialism." Apparently the second part of the sentence represents the I.L.P.'s notion that social reforms are stepping stones to Socialism, although Mrs. Hamilton herself says "there must be a fundamental change" (page 8) and refers contemptuously to the social legislation of the last half century as "State grants in aid of wages" (page 14). It is implied that Marx also believed that mere wretchedness would make Socialists, which is again untrue. Does any sane person expect Socialists to be recruited from slums, workhouses and prisons, or from the dregs of society generally? If misery, in the sense accepted by Mrs. Hamilton, would make Socialists, how might we thank the capitalists for their share in causing the Volga famine.

The effects of the degradation imposed on the workers by the present system of society are such that there are many whose physical condition of life and whose opportunities of mental development sufficiently explain their failure to take an intelligent interest in their own welfare and that of their class. This explanation cannot be offered for more fortunately placed people like Mrs. Hamilton, and unless, therefore, she has deliberately misrepresented, she is guilty at least of inexcusable negligence.

H.

"The longing for knowledge has been the cause of speculative attempts to explain the phenomena of life and nature at a time when lack of experience and observation made inductive understanding impossible. Experience was then supplemented by speculation. In later times when experience had grown, previous speculation was generally recognised as erroneous. But it nevertheless requires thousands of years of repeated disappointments on one side and numerous brilliant successes of the inductive method on the other before these speculative hobbies came into disfavour."—JOSEPH DIETZGEN.—"Positive Outcome of Philosophy."

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE

S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

By W. H. Thompson, Solicitor. 2s. 6d. Labour Publishing Co., 6, Tavistock Square, W.C. 1.

This is another of the Labour Publishing Company's useful books. True, it deals with the administration of capitalist laws—made to assist the smooth running of the "wheels of industry"—but although the author in his preface describes his as "not propagandist," at the same time he does not claim to be impartial. He treats his subject with a definite bias towards the worker—and this plain statement of the Act shows the nature of our capitalist administration in no uncertain manner. Mr. Thompson has outlined a complicated subject in a clear and concise manner, and all workers who are likely to come in contact with the operation of the Act would do well to purchase this book.

Its production is a credit to the publishers—neatly bound, well written, clear type, with a useful index—it deserves a wide circulation. Its price makes it possible for every Trade Union branch to purchase a copy, and a study of it should help workers to avoid many of those apparently trivial mistakes and omissions which allow employers and Insurance Companies to escape observing the provisions of the law.

Inside the capitalist system, while the care of the casualties of industry remains a legal obligation unwillingly borne and readily shirked, instead of a social duty, it is for the workers to get the maximum amount possible. The scope of the book is limited in this sense, but within the limit it is excellent.

R. BIRD.

"We may leave certain objects of scientific research to professionals, but general thought is a public matter which every one should be required to attend to himself."

JOSEPH DIETZGEN.

Will sympathisers of the Party in

GLASGOW

desirous of forming a Branch in that district communicate with

H. J. WATSON,

5, Elliott St., Glasgow.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spiceal-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

DEPTFORD.—Sec., J. Veasey, 24, Marlton-st., E. Greenwich, S.E. 10. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays in month, at 8 o'clock, at 495, New Cross-rd., S.E. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Andrew Porter, 12a, Kings-rd., Portobello.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at The Arcadians, 42, Amhurst-rd., Hackney Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 3, Lyveden-rd., Tooting, S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays, at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 19, Beechfield-rd., Finsbury Pk., N.4. Branch meets Fridays, The Trades Hall, 7, Bruce-grove, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN. Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 6 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 5.30 p.m.
Manor Park, Earl of Essex, 3.30 p.m.
Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 a.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m.
Walthamstow, Hoe Street Station, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.
Tottenham, Junction Clyde-road and Phillip-lane, 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE
**SOCIALIST
STANDARD**

**SEPT TO DEC
1922**

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 217. Vol. 19.]

LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

GUILD "SOCIALISM."

A GOOD THING FOR CAPITALIST RATEPAYERS.

The "London Building Guild" commenced its existence in July, 1920, by promising to show government officials and builders how to build houses more cheaply and at the same time pay their workers for loss of time through sickness or inclement weather.

An offspring of the "Guild Socialist" movement, it endorsed the principles and promises of Guild Socialism, claiming that the workers themselves would control, and that by the growth and extension of their movement the workers would gradually gain control over the whole of industry and be enabled thereby to set up a new order of society in which the capitalist would be entirely eliminated.

Because of the demand for workers' dwellings the Building Guild rapidly outstripped the guilds of other industries. Their contracts, according to the "Building Guildsman," May, 1922, spread over 70 Guild committees, amount to £3,000,000. Notwithstanding this rapid growth, however, it is questionable whether the Guild is financially sound. The Co-operative Wholesale Society, concerned about the competition between their building department and the Guilds, have declined to finance them further, and the Guilds have retaliated by placing their insurance business elsewhere. The Federation of Building Trade Operatives have come to the rescue of the Guild for the time being, but the latter is evidently in a tight corner financially as they are making desperate appeals for loans. The June number of the "Building Guildsman," displays on its

cover in bold type the words, "Lend promptly or the Guild can't develop." Before doing so, however, the trade unionist, at any rate, will do well to critically examine the need for its development.

What, in the first place, would the workers say of a builder, or any other capitalist, who, while constantly boasting of the extension of his business, appealed to them for loans in order to carry out the work? Yet this is what the Guild does; because under it the workers organise themselves merely to give service. The capitalist is eliminated but the Guild does not get the profit, while the local authorities get their houses at the bare cost of labour and materials. The Guild contract, according to Mr. Ernest Selley, writing in the "Building Guild in London," is described as follows:—

"The Guild form of contract, as approved by the Ministry of Health for Municipal Housing Schemes, provides that the price paid by the local authorities shall be the prime cost of material and labour at standard rates. To this sum, 6 per cent. is added to cover head office administration, plant, insurance, and, if necessary, interest on borrowed capital. In addition, there is an allowance of £40 a house to enable the Guild to guarantee continuous pay to its workmen in all contingencies. Thus, with full publicity as to costs, the Guild removes all doubt as to the existence of invisible margins and hidden profits."

In the London District Area committees are set up consisting of delegates from trade unions and there is also a board of directors elected by the trade unions affiliated to the National Federation of Building Trade Operatives. The board is

responsible for the appointment of managers and headquarters staff while the local committees make arrangements for the supply of labour. Members of the committees can be selected by the committee itself, to fill the best jobs without reference to their qualifications, and the way is open for wire pulling and jobbery. It is easy to see that whatever line the committees adopt there is bound to be friction over this question. Where jobs are concerned there is always competition and jealousy, together with numerous charges of corruption, true or untrue.

The business of the Guilds is carried on by means of borrowed capital, the interest on which is a portion of the surplus value produced by the Guild workers. Whether the Guild obtains a share of this surplus value for the extension of their business, or for any other purpose, does not transpire. In building working-class dwellings, however, they profess to be prompted by a desire to keep the cost of building low in order that the rents may be low; but the corporations they build for are under no obligation in this respect, and whatever profits are made by them on the letting go to the relief of capitalist ratepayers. Neither corporations nor guildsmen can any longer pretend that the workers are affected by reductions in rates, when every reduction in the cost of living—even where sliding scales are not in operation—is a signal for a reduction in wages.

Maintenance during sickness and inclement weather is made the most of by Guild propagandists. Really it is their only asset, though such payment is not confined to the Guilds nor does it represent a big slice out of profits. In itself it is certainly not worth the tremendous propaganda of confusion carried on by Guild Socialists. As an immediate benefit it is small compensation for the extra amount of unemployment likely to be caused by the general adoption of Guild methods—if all the Guild tales of quantitative results are true. Moreover, the Guilds can only guarantee employment while they obtain contracts; to do this they must be cheaper than capitalist firms.

They must enter the competitive market with the ordinary capitalist—who only differs from them in that he does not promise a millenium when he has captured all the trade—adopting all his methods for intensive exploitation of their wage slaves.

In fact they have already arrived at this point and the need for coercing and hustling their workers is not only admitted but is seriously discussed in the May issue of the "Building Guildsman," by Mr. S. G. Hobson, who says:—

"If we succeed in making Labour the first charge upon the industry and in consequence establish industrial maintenance; and if, as a result, production falls to an uneconomic level, one of the pillars of the Guild edifice would be seriously shaken. No use blinking that!

"As a matter of fact, it is not true. Guild production, generally stated, is in excess of capitalist production, whilst there can be no question of Guild quality. But it is true that there are men working on Guild contracts who are without conviction of any kind, and who regard the Guild very much as they would regard an employer. Let us be quite frank: these men are a danger to Guild development. Whatever the cost, they must be dealt with.

"There still remains, however, the broad question: Must Guild discipline be maintained by the usual Capitalist methods of dismissal, driving, threats, and (wherever possible) Taylorism, piece-work, and bonus? Or is there a better way?"

We see, therefore, that it is merely a question of the method, there is no doubt about the necessity of getting more out of the workers even though "Guild production, generally stated, is in excess of capitalist production."

The capitalist nature of the Guild is fully demonstrated in the above quotation; particularly in the assertion that production must be kept at an economic level. The cry of the capitalist everywhere and always.

The quality of Guild work, too, is always stressed by their advocates; but this is a doubtful advantage from the workers standpoint. Many workers owe their jobs to the fact that capitalists, as a rule, pay more attention to cheapness and quantity than they do to quality, with the result that expenditure on repairs and maintenance becomes necessary.

Again, why should the employee of the Guild regard it as anything else but an employer? What else is it? Is he not exploited by the Guild? The Guild committee may give their services free. Their customers may obtain a better and cheaper commodity; but all that only proves the Guild worker's more intensive exploitation, because, after all, he only gets wages; no more and no less than other capitalist employees.

Guild Socialism is a fraud on the workers because it promises to eliminate the capitalist while it retains capitalism. It patches up

the wages system with maintenance, instead of showing that wages, or the price of labour power, must always be but a mere fraction of the wealth produced by the workers.

Guild Socialists promise betterment for the workers here and now, and an easy transition from Capitalism to Socialism. Already their chief concern is for the financial success of their business contracts and not at all for the education of the workers in Socialism, without which there can be no transition, easy or otherwise.

F. F.

SHELLEY.

IN HIS WAY, ONE OF US.

Innumerable days of my life I wish to forget; three days I will always remember with joy. On one of those latter days I read *The Communist Manifesto* for the first time. On another of the days I saw some of Van Gogh's pictures at the first exhibition in this country of the work of the post-impressionists of France. On the third, and almost the last, of my joy-days my father gave me a book, "The Poems of Percy Bysshe Shelley."

Shelley is the poet I care for beyond all other poets. He dreamed, loved, wept, and sang; he helped his friends and those who were not his friends—he gave heaps of money away—he went his own way—none could tie him down—he was a wild yet gentle man, and his immortal "sweetest songs are those which tell of saddest thought."

I have for years read Shelley. I have not come across a more useful or beautiful purifying influence than Shelley's work. And in his day he was a Revolutionist.

A Revolutionist! Never mind... he's been dead a hundred years. Moreover, he believed if you only quietly proclaimed your ideas all would run smoothly. For a short time the rulers' soldiers might "slash and stab and maim and hew" as they did at Peterloo. The business of the rebel was to look earnestly and pityingly upon the armed men. The soldiers would then sheathe their swords—the rulers would recognise the immemorial injustice done to the toilers, be purified by the martyrdom of the masses, and make amends for their tyranny. Shelley

didn't live to hear of the Commune of Paris. He couldn't possibly have seen photographs in the picture papers of Lloyd George, hat in hand, before the Cenotaph.

No... Such an idea of passive resistance was born of his own instinctive gentleness. Could Shelley, even with his wonderful mind, imagine the depths of fiendishness to which a ruling class will sink so they may keep all their privileges? He knew the schools of his day planted base ideas; he knew the churches were used to muddle the minds of potential rebels, and he exposed the crime; he fathomed the duplicity of Castlereagh and Pitt and Ellenborough, but I wonder if it was possible for any man in Shelley's time to accurately picture the Society of to-day? For crafty brutality there was nothing like it in the old Roman days of slavery—in the morning of capitalism. The despots were somewhat inexperienced; the arch-fiends and the master hypocrites of the afternoon of capitalism were unborn.

May be, inadvertently by innuendo, I am unjust. Perhaps Shelley advocated no definite "tactic" of Revolution. He looked around him and brooded upon the loveliness and the mighty riddles of the universe. He went down many rivers and came upon mountains. Throughout the year he was out in the open air. He became familiar with the silence and solitude of winter. He came to know the colours and noises and songs of the whole year by heart. And yet—"my fellow man is in chains"—he said. Not all the "unpremeditated art" of Nature, not all the music of a summer's sky, could make Shelley deaf to the rattle of the iron. Million upon million died knowing nothing of the mystery and grandeur and joy of life. The milk and honey were possessed by liars, traitors, and fools—to the multitude, the dust and ashes.

Shelley wished everyone to be free. Have not all men worth their salt wished the same? All considerate men at some time or other have wished to "re-mould things nearer to the heart's desire." But the strange man whose boat got upset and broken in the Bay of Spezzia in 1822 was one of the most constant, indefatigable, and impassioned advocates of Freedom the world has ever known. His music of thunder and sweetness, love of liberty and antipathy to tyranny, has helped many a one to a realisation of the infamy of capi-

talist class rule. Shelley prepares the mind for the easy acceptance of the principles of Socialism. He fills the mind with a wild hatred of slavery. Marx gives that hate direction. Shelley was the trumpet that sang to battle. Marx supplies us with the weapons. We are encouraged, inspired by the writer of "Prometheus," "Queen Mab," "The Masque of Anarchy," "The Odes" . . . we are awakened, infuriated by the thundrous, supremely impassioned music of revolt—then comes the cloudless reasoning of the philosophic, scientific Marx, saying: "Go here—go there—destroy and build in this way."

So we march forward with the times. The incessant songs help us on our way. They comfort us in the prisons, they give us heart when things seem still as death, they are the accompaniment to our words at the street corners. It is a strong, sweet and formidable music that is ours. It is the music of a whole storm—beginning, middle with its might, and end with its peace. The calm has yet to come. It will come if the workers "Defy power which seems omnipotent," as Shelley says, in the way Marx suggests.

In letters, leaflets, pamphlets, and poetry Shelley criticised the vile institutions of his day. He wrote exquisitely of comradeship and trenchantly of all forms and phases of injustice. Blockheads advised "Mr. Shelley" to renounce his "pernicious doctrines." But "Mr. Shelley" was wilful—in comparison with some contemporaneous public men, he was quite a naughty boy. Even after advice from "The Quarterly" he obstinately wrote poetry, "The Masque of Anarchy," in which he urged a nation of quiet slaves to "Rise like lions" in unvanquishable number, shatter their chains, and control the world and all its wealth.

That happened long ago. What would such an irreconcilable poet say to-day. Far as I can remember, one of his songs is a little like this:—

"Sow seed, but let no tyrant reap;
Find wealth, let no imposter heap;
Weave robes, let not the idle wear;
Forge arms, in your defence to bear."

Would he have been with Derby, Snowden, Churchill, and Macdonald on the recruiting platform in 1914? Would he, who succoured an unhappy prostitute, have smiled like a very Thomas upon the systems which make women prefer the streets to the workshop? Would he have written like Rudyard Kip-

ling? Can a bird singing innocently among the clouds become a bird of prey?

Shelley was thirty years old when he went down in the waters of Italy. Think of the volume of his work—think of the way he strived to overthrow the tyranny he detested. Though we are not quite as Shelley was, still we can work as hard. His genius was particular and inimitable—his energy we may have. Francis Bacon loved roses. In their season they were on his tables every day. Macauley says that by putting roses upon our tables we may in one way at least resemble the philosopher. If resemblance to such men is desirable, then let us work hard for the emancipation of humanity, and in that way resemble Shelley. To get a rose in a jug on a table is fairly easy—the idler can do it, and then be as much like Lord Bacon as Churchill with a silk hat is like a statesman or an ape with a crown is like a king. But hard work upon right lines will prove manhood.

Shelley has played his part in the great awakening of men, just as Marx played his, as we play ours, as all our readers can play theirs. The scientist, philosopher, and singer, age by age, so far as the development of Society would permit, have contributed to the freeing of our thoughts. They have given us ecstasy and knowledge. And the selfish ruling class cannot understand this. Ecstasy and knowledge, music and wisdom mean as little to such people as Gallipoli and Russia or work and wages. Shelley liked such people much as we do; much as G.B.S. likes roast pork and a bottle of Bass.

But even if Shelley and Marx and lots of others have done their best, we still have a lot of cross-country marching to do. We will have to tread over much rough ground, and there will be a good many nights in between now and the end. Yet we must constantly go forward with a clear vision of that we wish to achieve. We will go on with light hearts; for have we not the companionship of the wonderfulest singer of all time? The "Unvanquishable number" will assemble in some night or other. The principles which, when accepted, mean Freedom will be understood by great numbers, and the wounds of the world will be healed by Socialism. In plain language, that means the people who now own the land and the machinery of wealth production will be dispossessed. It means the workers will take

possession of the land and machinery necessary for the production of wealth—and wealth will be produced in abundance and distributed among the people who produce wealth. Even that is not stated so plainly as some writers for the *Standard* can state it. Read what my comrades say; study our principles thoroughly.

Finis! And yet I would say more. I would say that we find happiness in our work. There is fellowship among the workers for Socialism, life in the principles of Socialism, and selfishness and death elsewhere. Emulate the zeal and heroism of Shelley; fill your hearts, as they say, with his emotions and music, get a grip on the principles which actuate us, endeavour to make your fellow workers see the truth of your belief, and kick the capitalist along "The primrose path to the everlasting bonfire."

H. M. M.

"WHAT COULD YOU DO WITH £600?"

The above question is extracted from an advertisement which is appearing daily in the Capitalist Press.

In case there should be any members of the working class seriously puzzling their brains as to what they could do in the event of such an enormous amount of wealth being thrown at them, the £1,000 Fund Committee is prepared to supply the answer FREE OF CHARGE to any person or persons disposing of one BOOK of stamps and remitting the proceeds thereof within ONE MONTH from date of issue.

Stamps books can be obtained on application to the Secretary, T.P.F., 17, MOUNT PLEASANT.

£1,000 FUND.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Already Acknowledged ..				840	9	0½
By Donations:—						
"J.C.C." ..	4	0	0			
Kirk, J.F., New Zealand ..	2	6				
Islington Branch ..	1	0	0			
Anonymous ..			6			
"F.J.H." ..	1	0	0			
"W.H." ..	1	0	0			
"H.R." ..	2	6				
					7	5 6
Sale of Stamps:—						
Book No. 11 (Tottenham) ..	2	6				
" " 28 (Watford) ..	10	0				
" " 59 (Tottenham) ..	3	6				
					16	0
					848	10 6½

A.S.C./22:8:22

PRODUCING AND PAYING.

A GRIM FAIRY TALE.

When discussing with the average member of the working class, or at meetings that bring forward their opinions, as soon as the Socialist attempts to show the futility of concern with this or that expenditure of the master class, he is invariably asked, "But don't we pay for everything?" and this to the questioner appears an obvious truth.

Indignation is often aroused and shown when it is pointed out that the working class cannot have any part in the paying or contributing towards the colossal expense of running the capitalist system of society. True, some may feel the injustice of a system which on all sides presents itself as a glaring contrast between stupendous wealth and sheer stark naked poverty. True, others may dimly perceive that the existence of this wealth is due to the efforts of the working class. That at the docks, on the railways, in the mine or the office, the activities of the master class are unknown—from the highest to the lowest, skilled or unskilled, all are workers. If, however, those who think thus, do not carry their observations and enquiries farther, such knowledge remains superficial, and will lead to wrong conclusions. They must go deeper and seek to understand what portion of the wealth that is produced accrues to the working class. They will then know that they CANNOT PAY either directly or indirectly towards the upkeep of the very system that exploits them; though it is quite desirable from the master class point of view to foster the belief that they can and do. When we speak of the working class, we mean the class that works as the name implies. This presupposes a non-working class. The former are without any property in the means of life, and have only their bodily activities to sell in order to live. The latter own the earth and all upon it (machinery, mines, raw material, railways, etc.).

Wealth used to exploit labour power for profit is capital and its owners are capitalists. Capital is therefore merely wealth used for a particular purpose and is itself the product of wage labour.

Now the working class have only three methods of existing, either begging, stealing or working. Obviously the first two methods cannot become general, and to a small section, begging, unless upon a large

scale (such as the Salvation Army and various charitable organisations) is a rather poor occupation; while to steal, after everything worth stealing has been stolen, with politically controlled force to maintain its ownership, is also a foolish proceeding. There is, therefore, only that enervating pastime left to the workers, to work—for somebody else. And what does work give when obtainable? Wages. And what are they? Marx and Engels wrote in 1848: "The average price of wage labour is the minimum wage, i.e., the sum of the necessities of life, absolutely needful to keep the worker in life as a worker. Thus what the wage earner appropriates by his labour is just as much as is necessary to assure him a bare existence" (Communist manifesto.) But the worker is paid in money, and it is this fact that disguises from him the exploiting nature of the transaction, the buying of his labour power. What the master really buys is the full use of that energy, but when it is expended in the production of wealth, the worker produces much more in value than the value of his own necessities of life expressed in price as wages. Six hundred years ago a man could produce in twelve weeks labour sufficient to sustain himself and family for a whole year (Thorold Rogers.) How much greater must be his productivity to-day with the aid of steam, electricity, machinery, and every labour saving device science has placed at his disposal. What the worker produces over and above the value of what he receives as wages the Socialist calls "SURPLUS VALUE." And it is from this source, whether it takes the form of Rent, Interest, or Profit that the masters MUST PAY.

The worker is robbed of the major portion of the wealth he alone produces and is left relatively poorer year by year as that wealth increases. All improvements in the means and methods of wealth production must benefit the comparatively few owners of those means, for to them belong the results. While the workers remain labour power sellers they cannot command more than the price resulting from that sale (wages).

If the master class can persuade the workers to continue in the belief that the latter have a part in the paying of national or local expenditure, they can help to disguise the exploiting nature of their system. The worker cannot pay out of what he

NEVER RECEIVES, though at times he argues that he pays indirectly by consuming such things as tobacco, beer, etc. Even here again it is a question of wages. Whatever the sum total of the prices of the necessities required to reproduce the worker (including some sort of entertainment and small luxuries) must be given to him first in his wage, otherwise his labour power deteriorates. When prices rose during the war, bonuses had to be given to cover the increased cost of living; when they fell to any extent bonuses disappeared, or in other words, wages came down. The sliding scale is another example of the adjustment of wages to the cost of living.

Capitalist agents often tell the workers that it is the employed that must support the unemployed. Their object is twofold, to delude the workers, and endeavour to keep as low as possible their masters expenditure. At times they give the game away by stating that it pays better to receive "Guardians relief" than work for wages, and that's saying something. How little the reduction of such expenditure concerns the workers was evidenced recently at Poplar, when certain Labour members of the Council went to prison, avowedly in the interests of the workers, but we find the truth in strange places, thus! "We have in our possession a return showing that the 'large ratepayers' actually saved in rates £300,000, as a result of the 'Poplar Labour Borough Council.' One firm in Millwall saved over £3,000, and another in Bow £1,222." (Ed., "East London Pioneer," April, 1922). Certainly good for the "large" ratepayers.

No, fellow workers, if the paying were yours the masters would trouble little about the expense much less spend large sums in propaganda upon matters which didn't concern them. What concerns you is how long you intend to be the victims of profits and production for sale. Understand your importance in society and your historic mission as real men and women and then organise for Socialism. Social ownership of the means of producing wealth for use and not profit. That will destroy the power of the few to dominate the lives of the masses. The working "class" will then be abolished because all but the child and the feeble will take part in the useful necessary work of society and all will enjoy the benefits such social life will give. MAC.

"REMEDIES."

The remedies which were propounded as a solution for the slump in trade which has prevailed are now well known. First it was "increased production," "reduced wages," "longer hours," and "Governmental Economy."

A year or more is surely a reasonable period in which to test the efficacy of these remedies. Without doubt they have all been given a fair trial. The workers have increased their output, not so much as a result of the exhortations of Clynes, Brownlee, etc., as from economic necessity. Every worker knows that the enormous number of unemployed is used as a means to compel him to work harder. In almost every factory the workers have to compete with each other in order to retain their jobs; the slowest are the first to be put off. Wages have been reduced wholesale, and hours, in many cases, have been extended. Also some attempt has been made by the Government to curtail its expenditure.

That these expedients have failed to cure the slump is unquestionable. And no wonder!

The slump is brought about by the excess of supply of commodities over the demand for them; therefore to increase production is but to worsen the situation. Every reduction in wages, in general, reduces the purchasing power of the working class, who constitute the enormous majority of the population. A great cause of the lack of demand in relation to the supply of commodities is the fact that the workers receive in the form of wages only a small portion of the total wealth they produce. To take a step, then, which must lead to a further reduction in the demand for commodities is a peculiar way of solving a problem which, from the point of view of the capitalist, requires an increase in demand for its solution.

The latest nostrum trotted out by the capitalists through their press was "reduce income tax!"

"This humble petition sheweth that whereas grave distress is being caused by the existing high taxation, which prevents the revival of trade and the return of prosperity to the nation, thereby also keeping in a state of unemployment a large number of people."

This solemn nonsense is part of a petition to Parliament which the workers were called upon by the "Daily Mail" to sign.

I have copied it from the "Weekly Dispatch" (30.4.22) and have searched the paper through for any proof, or argument in support of, the assertions made in the petition.

How the spending of the shilling in the pound by the capitalist income tax payers on champagne, etc., instead of by the Government on salaries to civil servants, etc., can have any effect in relieving unemployment is nowhere explained. The usual argument urged in favour of lightening the capitalists "burden" of taxation is that by so doing more money would be at their disposal thus enabling them to provide more employment for the working class. It is only necessary to point to the capital lying idle or being but partly used at the present time in order to show the fallacy of this argument. If capital already existing in the form of means of production, raw material, etc., cannot be used, obviously there is little room for the investment of new capital.

But even if the argument were sound, the workers, by supporting the agitation and signing the petition are acquiescing in their own exploitation. When the capitalist "provides employment," he does so only in order to exploit, to rob those whom he employs.

This depression is a world wide phenomenon. Capitalists are compelled to reduce the prices of their commodities and curtail production. This means to them a considerably reduced income; to the smaller capitalists it spells imminent bankruptcy. Each capitalist, then, is compelled to seek for means to compensate himself for these losses. The methods he adopts to this end are, urging the workers to work harder, thereby increasing their output, and therefore the surplus value appropriated by the capitalist. Reductions in wages have the same effect; less for the worker, more for the capitalist. The desire of the capitalist to reduce his expenses has given rise to the demand for Government economy and reduced taxation.

The support of the workers for these measures has been gained by telling them that only by these means, reducing the cost of production and so enabling the capitalist to compete more successfully with foreign rivals could any improvement in their (the workers) position be brought about. This

(Continued on page 207.)

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 3s. 0d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

SEPTEMBER 1922

SHALL WE MOURN?

On August 15th the newspapers displayed large headlines announcing the death of Lord Northcliffe, the newspaper magnate. It is an interesting sidelight on the sham hostilities of the papers, that those who were lately his bitter enemies—on paper!—are now deploring his loss as that of “a great national figure and a prince of journalists.”

Working men who ponder over the actions of such “great men” are not moved to deplore his loss. It is to them but the loss of one who has climbed upon their shoulders; a member of the privileged class; a staunch supporter of the evil that Capitalism signifies—the havoc of wars and the miseries of peace.

The daily Press, without exception, exists in the main, not merely to give news “calculated to attract at the moment the legitimate interest of a reasonable man or woman,” as one paper would have us believe, but to provide a source of income to the proprietors. In doing this, it endeavours to gloss over the worst features of Capitalism and keep the workers satisfied with the present system of wealth production, which brings ease and comfort to the propertied few, and overwork and misery to the property-less many.

A large slice of the revenue of a newspaper comes from advertisements. A paper

that cannot command a large circle of advertisers stands little chance of surviving.

Broadly speaking, those who advertise in the newspapers (we are referring to large advertisers, of course) favour the paper having the largest circulation among those interested in such advertisers' wares; at the same time, being Capitalists, they will fight shy of a paper publishing information likely to harm their enterprises. Consequently the proprietors of a newspaper have two points of prime importance to bear in mind in the conduct of their journals—to obtain as large a circulation as possible, and, at the same time, to avoid, if possible, publishing anything that may offend their advertisers. The importance of the latter point many an Editor has learnt to his cost.

From the above we can see what attitude a flourishing newspaper must of necessity take towards the workers. It must side with the masters in keeping the workers in servitude. The news we are favoured with is selected with this end in view, though the papers dare not keep back some matters without risking a fall in the circulation upon which largely depends the quantity and value of the advertisements received.

Lord Northcliffe was a successful newspaper proprietor because his papers were conducted with a careful eye to these points; in other words, he was an enemy of the working class.

How much the Press is concerned about the workers is illustrated by the statement of one paper (*Daily News*, 15/8/22), which, in an editorial, makes the following reference to Northcliffe's death:—

“Next to the war, it is probably the most important fact in the history of this generation.”

What a callous lie! The most important fact in the history of this generation is the fact that hundreds of thousands—ay, millions—of human beings are dying of overwork and underfeeding in presence of wealth, and means of producing wealth, accumulated in quantities undreamt of in the world before. Beside this the death of a newspaper magnate sinks into insignificance.

The *Daily News* (15/8/22) whilst commenting on Northcliffe's death, made the following significant remarks:—

“His judgment of men was sound, with the result that he surrounded himself with a band of able colleagues and assistants, who did much to aid him in establishing and carrying on the

manifold undertakings of which he was the founder.”

The above remarks may excuse us for making a little digression.

Turn to the life of any of the so-called “Great Men” produced by Capitalism, and it will be found that the tale is nearly always similar; they climbed to wealth and fame by appropriating the product of other men's brains.

In this connection two men in particular may be mentioned—Andrew Carnegie and Pierpont Morgan. Both acquired huge fortunes, and both accomplished this end by using the genius of others.

Carnegie, the “great” ironmaster, knew nothing of metallurgy, but employed those who did, and rose to affluence on the results of their genius. He successfully took the fruits of others' toil from the time he got control of Woodruff's invention of the embryonic Pullman car until his mills turned out steel made by the Bessemer process, the process discovered by a genius whose name is unknown.

Pierpont Morgan acquired much of his “fame” in connection with the organisation of combinations in the American railway industry. He is spoken of as having had a marvellous head for taking in the position of the affairs of a company almost at a glance. How did this “great” man do the trick? The following quotation from “The Life Story of J. Pierpont Morgan,” by Carl Hovey (Heinemann), gives the key:—

“All credit for this series of railroad rehabilitations is by no means his alone; to one of his partners—the late Charles H. Coster—was assigned the task of solving the intricate and interwoven relations of railroad obligations, bonds, underlying bonds, collateral trust mortgages, and every other artificial form of securing a loan—and determining the amount fairly represented by each. Coster was a kind of rare genius, a sort of financial chemist, and possessed a gift of analysis in this new and difficult field; it often happened, when everyone else was baffled, that he alone was able to lay before his chief solutions clear and sound, which made it possible for Mr. Morgan to go ahead with his plans for a new structure” (p. 233).

That is how the trick was done! And that is the way the “prince of journalists” did the trick.

When the workers of the world own the product of their labours, there will be no need for one to steal the work of another. Each will take his part in the production of needful things, and each will share in the enjoyment of such things.

PRISON REFORM AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

Owing, partly at least, to the large but not surprising increase of crime which has followed the close of the war, much interest has of recent months been shown in prison treatment and punishment generally, and a fine opportunity has been afforded to reformers to prove that the present penal system has failed to reform the criminal or check the growth of crime. Their humanitarian demand for a new method has gained the more attention because of the demonstrable failure of the old.

Retired military officers, deprived of the twin joys of bullying their subordinates which their rank gave and of walking on “niggers,” which is the white man's privilege in the outlying parts of “our” Empire, conspire equally sincerely with amiable old ladies of the upper class to clamour for the all round application of the lash as a cure for what appears to them to be lack of discipline.

The interest has been maintained by press stunts about the Home Secretary's alleged discrimination between poor and wealthy prisoners, and by the publicity given to various persons (including the C.O.'s) of a type not previously well represented in jail; while the “Daily Herald,” without intentional humour, announces that it opposes capital punishment because “vengeance is mine, saith the Lord, I will repay” (7th July, 1922). Also an informative report has been issued by a Committee of the Labour Research Department.

While extensive knowledge of the facts is certainly possessed by many who have helped in the agitation, there has been a noticeable ignoring of important economic and class aspects.

The case made out against the present prison system is, considered alone, overwhelming. Experience shows that a very large percentage of first offenders who are committed to prison return again and again and become “habitual criminals.” Yet in seeming paradox we have the testimony of many investigators that there is no special criminal type. Thomas Mott Osborne, prison reformer and sometime Governor of “Sing-Sing” and other American jails, writes that there is

"no radical difference between the minds of men in prison and mine. We are all, I discovered, potential criminals" (*Daily Herald*, July 1st, 1922).

Conditions make criminals and while some respond to degrading influences more readily than others, habitual criminals are in the main those who through prison treatment and associations have been prevented from regaining their lost positions, poor though these may have been.

Prison reformers have to combat a popular misconception which holds twentieth century prisons to be havens of rest. Lack of knowledge and the equally important lack of sympathetic imagination, make it hard for the average person to believe that imprisonment can still be incredibly cruel. He has probably read of the state of order and cleanliness which prevails, and of the good and sufficient food supply. He knows too that actual physical discomfort, whether of corporal punishment or of living conditions, have been largely abolished as part consequence of the efforts of an earlier generation of penal reformers. What he does not know, and finds difficult to accept, is that the sufferings which now exist are no less real, though apparently less tangible, than those which have been removed. Incidentally it is a signal mark of the futility of philanthropy that Howard and others who gave their lives to the work of destroying various evils should themselves have been responsible for the creation of others equally outrageous. These people observed that in the old debtors' jails the prisoners were herded together indiscriminately, with results far from beneficial to the less hardened and more impressionable. They agitated successfully for the institution of the cellular system which condemns each prisoner to the drab confinement of his own cell for by far the greater part of the day, never realising that severance from the friends and interests of the outside world was the most intolerable of the burdens prison imposed, and that for those who were in a position of helplessness and hopelessness the company of fellow prisoners did at least create an illusion of comradeship and help to make the isolation less galling. A writer in the "*Manchester Guardian*" (30th June, 1922) remarks that the

"physical filth and barbarity that characterised our gaols little more than a century ago have

been replaced by a system that, in its mental and moral effects upon the prisoner, constitutes but a more refined form of cruelty";

and Dr. Starkie, a police doctor, who has suffered imprisonment (he alleges innocently) and who has written on his experiences, describes prison with a strong journalistic flavour, but not inaccurately, as a "Living Tomb."

Another writer reviewing the above mentioned report, says:—

"Even a few months of imprisonment appears to be sufficient in many, if not most, cases to produce an effect upon memory, concentration, and the power of will. In the case of the long sentence prisoner, this process of deterioration may lead to premature senility, or a childish weakness of mind which renders him almost incapable of resuming normal life in any efficient capacity." (*Reynolds*, July 2nd, 1922).

Perhaps it is unfair to say that the prison authorities do *nothing* to help their charges. After lack of education, bad surroundings, poverty and insecurity of livelihood have combined to produce the criminal; and after confinement, the denial of recreation for the mind, and the brain-numbing prison tasks imposed, have reduced him to a state of acute mental anguish or stupidity, harmful busybodies are permitted to provide him with the pestilential literature of some religious tract society in an endeavour to reclaim his soul for the Lord.

In summing up, the "*Manchester Guardian*" writer quoted above, holds prisons utterly condemned by their

"depressing bareness, their perpetual silence, their monotonous uniformity, and the obtrusive and military discipline,"

and affirms of imprisonment that

"if conceived with the express object of unfitting a man for subsequent freedom, it could not have been more cunningly devised."

Yet it must be emphasised that while these charges are hardly capable of serious question, they do not go to the root of the matter.

The others who would make prison life more nearly what it was in the "good old days" are equally wide of the mark. Those who would reform the criminal by kindness and those who would flog him into virtue alike fail to understand the problem.

The truth is that neither of these groups has sought to explain the origin and existence of crime. Dr. Starkie says:—

"as a doctor, I know that the cures for crime

are the same as the remedies for all social disorders,"

and he correctly adds that the problem, which has to be solved, of removing bad living conditions and providing proper education, makes the subject really a political one. Again, T. M. Osborne admits that

"anything done to improve social conditions will reduce crime,"

and it is a fairly widely recognised and easily understood phenomenon, that unemployment and distress are always accompanied by numerous crimes, especially by robbery.

Let us briefly examine the nature of the various things gathered under the one word crime.

The human race has inherited from its animal ancestors, and has acquired during its early condition of perpetual struggle with nature, certain fundamental characteristics or instincts. The continuance and development of the race depended on these and they have persisted with little real modification under conditions of civilisation. These impulses, such as self-preservation, the need for food and for protection against the elements, have taken different forms under widely varying conditions, and, given a long period of prosperity and comparative peace, it may have seemed that the cultivation of the arts of civilisation had altered man's savage nature. But let passions be stirred by war, fear be roused by disaster, and the threat of hunger or death and it is soon seen how little man has changed in this respect.

Other important characteristics have also been acquired. Men are by nature gregarious; it is natural for them to associate in communities. They have developed co-operation in production to its present far advanced stage, and in periods and empires of comparative stability, truly wonderful cultural edifices have been built on this foundation. In those primitive societies where social co-operation in production obtained, and the means of living, simple though they were, were held in common, this social solidarity and the human need for food and shelter were in conformity; but this condition long since ceased to be. The means of wealth production have become privately owned; and slave and slave owner, feudal proprietor and serf, and

finally wage-worker and capitalist have faced each other in conflict. The savage and his tribe, self-interest and the loyalty of kinship, were one; individual interests and thoughts of isolated existence were alike impossible. The various classes which have been dominant have had interests in opposition to those of their subject class, and their interests, their ideas, their codes of morality and ethics have prevailed throughout the particular society. The sense of social solidarity still shared by the oppressed has formed a useful buttress for their own oppression and at the same time has hidden the force on which ultimately it rested.

Not the community, but the capitalist class now owns the machinery of wealth production. This class lives on the proceeds of the robbery of the workers who, by their property-less condition, are compelled to operate that machinery for its owners, in return for doing which they receive as wages only part of the product. The capitalists, as a prime need, require to be maintained in possession, and that need is met by the State which controls the forces of society. Now crime consists roughly of two kinds of acts. Firstly those which are anti-social in the sense that they would conflict with the smooth working of any society, such, for instance, as murder and other attacks on persons; and secondly the more numerous and at present more important crimes which are actions detrimental to the interests and stability of the dominant class.

It has to be recognised that crime is a matter of definition in written law, or of the interpretation of custom, and not a questioning of the breach of some external and everlasting moral standard. The law itself arises directly out of, or has been adapted to, the needs of the ruling body. Vengeance is, in fact, not the Lord's, but the prerogative of the capitalist class.

This should not be confused with improper and prejudiced administration. While some Judges may, more or less, consciously allow their opinions to influence their decisions, this is probably rare and matters but little. It is the law, not its administration, which reflects its class origin. As Anatole France says:—

"the law, 'in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread.'"

But the millionaire just doesn't need to,

because his living is assured by the robbery of workers whom he pauperises.

Those who do not look below the surface are struck by the apparent inconsistency of the law. They point to the fact that men are hanged in peace time for killing their fellows, but that C.O.'s were imprisoned and threatened with death for refusing to kill; again, that there is only a difference of degree between ordinary robbery and the brigandish exploits of every civilised Empire against the territory and property of its civilised neighbours, or preferably, because it is safer, against the backward races. We, however, realising the supreme need for the ruling class to maintain their dominance, recognise that they can consistently, and in fact must, do all these things. Class government rests on force, and no government can or dare tolerate defiance from a minority, or even from one single individual, when such defiance threatens their supremacy. This is a rule to which there is no exception. No government can ignore it with impunity. The natural desire for food in hunger clashes with the property rights of the owners of the land and other means of food production. Thus it is easy to see how crimes against property have a direct economic basis and motive; but that is not the whole of the result of private ownership.

Not only does the starving man steal bread to allay his hunger, but through other disadvantages from which he as a worker suffers, his entire outlook on society may be distorted. The denial of proper education, decent living conditions, and opportunities of self-development produce indifference and actual hostility towards the restraints imposed by convention; and the consequent misdirection of instincts and desires denied proper outlet, gives rise to numerous other crimes, not themselves directly to be explained by the desire to live.

Most forms of crime then, other than those to which men are driven by poverty, owe their existence, or at least their aggravation to the numerous disadvantages suffered by the under dogs of society.

The present crime wave is therefore an instance of the chaos which has followed the rise of class division in society and the resulting conflict between the human needs of one section and the economic interests of the other. In this conflict the dis-

possessed class has to meet not only the might of the possessors but also the force of the accepted social regulations which, while appearing to have universal validity, really serve one class only.

Much of the activity of any Government must be devoted to regulating the day-to-day intercourse between its own subjects, for without such guarantee of security, trade and commerce would become impossible. Crimes against property by masses of striking workers or by individuals must be suppressed. This is true of democracies as of autocracies. It is imposed equally on the lately "rebel" Government of Ireland, as on the Bolsheviks; the Australian Labour Government has had to use State forces against strikers and maintain intact the prison system; and the Labour Party here, if it gets into power, must do the same or forfeit its right to govern. This necessity will remain while private property and consequent class government remain.

Faced then with the problem that many workers are seldom in a position of security or of employment at all, the Government must devise means of deterring them from turning to crime as a way out. They must make their places of detention for criminals worse than conditions outside. They have had fair success. Just as the military authorities undoubtedly succeeded in making military prisons and detention camps so hellish that few men would exchange the trenches for them, so the civil authorities have aimed at convincing the workers that semi-starvation is better than imprisonment.

Both the people who opposed the removal of the more barbaric army punishments and those who advocate greater severity in the treatment of civilian prisoners, are logical; but the latter fail because their method is now proving ineffective. The force of the conditions which induce to crime is so great that the old methods no longer serve. The war and the general loosening of restraints have had their effect. The ruling class must endeavour to solve this problem by changing the method; but most reformers forget that the problem they are considering is not the one which faces those who have the power to act. Not sympathy for the prisoners, but increased knowledge is behind the move of the capitalist class.

Mr. Osborne for instance:—

"believes in sending men to prison for crimes

Society could not allow them to throw monkey wrenches into its machinery. . . . I'm just a hard-headed business man who can't bear seeing good material going to waste anywhere. Society needs protection, and if society were protected by killing or putting prisoners in chains, I would advocate these methods. But it isn't."

Dean Inge puts his class position in a nutshell when he says:—

"With the exception of political criminals, whom I would treat with the utmost rigour, I advocate a determinist attitude towards crime. The treatment at first ought always to be curative."
(Daily Herald, July 14th, 1922).

In other words, political prisoners are men who deliberately attack the class privileges of Dean Inge and his kind, and must be beaten into submission. Ordinary criminals act blindly and may, many of them, be induced, if given the opportunity, to enter the "honest" occupation of providing profits for an employer. Reason dictates that a differentiation should be made, especially in view of the little result and high cost of maintaining prisons.

Experiments have shown that there is no need for the capitalist class to have to support a large "criminal" population. Many of those who have constantly returned to jail are there only because their record or their treatment has prevented them from entering the labour market on equal terms with other workers. Without therefore in any way lessening the deterrent nature of imprisonment, much of the great expense of keeping these misfits in prison can be got rid of if with proper training they can be made to starve submissively outside. This the capitalists can do, and in time will do.

The Socialist does not concern himself with it because it is not an agitation the workers can usefully support. His unconcern proceeds not from lack of sympathy for the victims, but from the knowledge that while the capitalists remain in power they will solve their own problem in their own way, and that the wider problem they cannot touch. Property crimes can be removed only by the removal of private ownership of the means of life and the political question of providing the education and surroundings without which self-restraint and social loyalty are impossible, can also be solved only by the preliminary conquest of power which shall enable the organised workers to set about building a new class-less social order. The efforts of penal reformers are in the meantime not

only futile for the end in view, but are also a hindrance to the Socialist propaganda which alone can remove the barriers to the very progress these reformers desire.

H.

"The materialistic doctrine, that men are the product of conditions and education, different men, therefore, the products of other conditions and changed education, forgets that circumstances may be altered by men and that the educator has himself to be educated. It necessarily happens, therefore, that society is divided into two parts, of which one is elevated above society. The occurrence simultaneously of a change in conditions and human activity can only be comprehended and rationally understood as a revolutionary fact."

—Marx.

Bound volumes of the SOCIALIST STANDARD can now be supplied as follows:—

1-year Volume. September, 1910, to August 1911	6/6
2-year Volume. September, 1910, to August, 1912	8/6
3-year Volume. September, 1910, to August, 1913	10/6
4-year Volume. September, 1910, to August, 1914	12/6
1-year Volume. September, 1914, to August, 1915	6/6
2-year Volume. September, 1914, to August, 1916	8/6
3-year Volume. September, 1914, to August, 1917	10/6
4-year Volume. September, 1914, to August, 1918	12/6
1-year Volume. September, 1918, to August, 1919	4/3
2-year Volume. September, 1918, to August, 1920	6/6
3-year Volume. September, 1918, to August, 1921	9/-

Postage extra.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF REVOLUTIONS.

For some years there has been a "boom" in "Sociology." Not long ago the demand for books upon social affairs was so limited that the publication of small popular and cheap volumes of the kind which to-day and for the past few years have been so abundant was not a commercial proposition, except to publishing houses which specialised in such works. Before the war the output showed a marked increase. But that event which, overwhelming though it appeared in its day, we may now regard as a mere political episode hardly warranting, when compared with coming conflicts already hinted at by the "experts," the title of the "Great" War, gave a further impetus to the publication of "sociological" treatises, enquiries and text books—because as the problems of society multiply or intensify, so do the attempts to solve them.

Looking over the shelves of a public library one may find works on "Unemployment," "Poverty," "Taxation," "Industrial Management," "Trades' Unions," "Political Reform," the "Structure of the State," "Education." One will see ponderous works and slim handbooks about "Primitive Society," "Early Law and Custom," "Feudalism," "Mediæval Guilds," and the "Factory System." All these will contain some useful information. Some will be sound in viewpoint and contents while others will be comparatively worthless. In such a collection, however, one subject of enormous importance to the student of society, both in its present and its past evolution, will be found to be practically, if not completely ignored, and that subject is the "Sociology of Revolutions." Very few, if any, works will be devoted to the consideration of the place of social revolution in history, while those which mention the subject at all do so casually, hastily, and in an utterly unconvincing way.

Apart from the fact that "revolution" is always a delicate subject with bourgeois writers and particularly so, to the extent of taboo, at a time when social problems are in pressing need of solution, there is a strong theoretical reason for this "peculiar omission."

Revolutions are generally considered by the bourgeois "sociologist" to be something apart from the normal processes of society, as disturbing, intruding factors unrelated to the conditions ordinarily determining social evolution and therefore outside the "proper scope" of their "science."

This mistaken notion, although based fundamentally upon an unconscious bias and being, therefore, as the psychologist would say, a "rationalisation" promoted by a politico-economic "complex" is related theoretically to two of the basic ideas which form the usual stock-in-trade of bourgeois social science.

The first of these is that evolution is usually, if not always, a "slow" and at any rate an uniform process. This idea is utterly unsound. The terms "slow" and "fast" are purely relative to some accepted standard of measurement when applied to evolution as to other aspects of motion. By what arbitrary standard are we to judge by comparison any evolutionary process to be slow or fast? The only general fact we know about universal evolution at all is that it shows no break in the continuous chain of cause and effect. The further notion that the rate of progression is uniform, is a pure fiction contradicted by facts from every branch of science.

The other fallacious idea which is common to orthodox writers on social science is that evolution must necessarily be governed by the same forces and take place in the same way and at the same rate in all the different branches of the social structure. This idea touches on the central problem in the study of the social revolution.

Marx was probably the first thinker to address himself to the solution of this problem, and in the introduction to his "Critique of Political Economy" (1859) will be found the summary of his conclusions, in which he shows what a revolution is and how it is brought about. This passage, which is given below, has become classic, and has been translated into practically every language spoken by civilised men:—

"In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material powers of pro-

duction. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of Society—the real foundation, on which rise legal and political superstructures and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political, and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they had been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into their fetters. Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations the distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic, or philosophic—in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself, so can we not judge of such a period of transformation by its own consciousness: on the contrary, this consciousness must rather be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social forces of production and the relations of production. No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have been developed; and new, higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society. Therefore, mankind always takes up only such problems as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely, we will always find that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions necessary for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation. In broad outlines we can designate the Asiatic, the ancient, the feudal, and the modern bourgeois methods of production as so many epochs in the progress of the economic formation of society. The bourgeois relations of production are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production—antagonistic not in the sense of individual antagonism, but of one arising from conditions surrounding the life of individuals in society; at the same time the productive forces developing in the womb of the bourgeois society create the material conditions for the solution of that antagonism. This social formation constitutes, therefore, the closing chapter of the pre-historic stage of human society" ("Critique of Political Economy," pages 11-13). R. W. H.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 8d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

"REMEDIES."

(Continued from page 199).

fallacy has been exposed frequently in the columns of the *Socialist Standard*; it is now exposed in the most convincing way by experience. Two years have gone by during which the various remedies have been tried and the situation is now, if anything, worse than ever.

The process of recovery from a trade crisis is, we know from past experience, a slow and gradual one. But even if the most extravagant forecasts of those who, from time to time shout "Trade is reviving," were realised, it would be but the prelude to another period of depression. The history of capitalism has been an alternation of prosperity and stagnation, of boom and slump. The worker, forced to sell his labour power for an existence wage, is buffeted about by the varying winds of supply and demand; overworked at one period, unemployed at another; his existence becoming ever more insecure, a slave to the capitalist class, he is the victim of the present system of society. This has been the lot of the worker under capitalism and his position must become worse as the system develops.

There is but one remedy for the poverty, unemployment and overwork suffered by the working class. It is the socialisation of the means of production and distribution, which are now owned by the capitalist class (a small minority in society) and used exclusively for their benefit.

The initial step towards the realisation of this object, fellow workers, is, once understanding your slave position in society and desiring your emancipation, to organise yourself along with us in the Socialist Party and help to bring to a close this system of slavery. J. D.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence.

FROM THE
S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spiceal-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

DEPTFORD.—Sec., J. Veasey, 24, Marlton-st., E. Greenwich, S.E. 10. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays in month, at 8 o'clock, at 435, New Cross-rd., S.E. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Andrew Porter, 12a, Kings-rd., Portobello.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at The Arcadians, 42, Amburst-rd., Hackney Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 3, Lyveden-rd., Tooting, S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays, at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 49, Napier rd., Philip Lane, N.15. Branch meets Fridays, The Trades Hall, 7, Bruce-grove, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 6 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 5.30 p.m.
Manor Park, Earl of Essex, 7.30 p.m.
Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 a.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m.
Walthamstow, Hoe Street Station, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.
Tottenham, Junction Clyde-road and Phillip-lane, 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.

**THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.****OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No 218. Vol. 19.]

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

THE OPTIMISTS.

It has been said that in Shakespeare's works there can be found lines to describe any type of man. This may or may not be so, but many of his descriptions of man in the bulk or individually fit the types we observe to-day.

After reading Mr. Herbert Smith's address to the Miners' Conference delegates at Blackpool, the thought that occurred to the writer was the one expressed so satirically in "Twelfth night."

"Some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them."

Mr. Smith has not displayed much originality or acumen during his career as a trade union official, especially since he has been President of the M.F.G.B.

During the lock-out of last year he cut a very sorry figure, rushing into No. 10, Downing Street appealingly exclaiming to Lloyd George, "You have got to offer us something!"

Without a great stretch of imagination we could see the effect of these words and the cringing of the E.C. of the Miners in stiffening the attitude of Lloyd George and the coal owners behind him. Smith is not renowned for mental alertness, and cannot be considered an improvement on former presidents, so that we can only conclude his "greatness has been thrust upon him." We need not go into the squabble between Smillie and Hodges over the job of leadership, but it might have some bearing on the fact that Smith is now President of the M.F.G.B.

As an example of what Shakespeare called "chop logic," his speech will take some beating, for he says, "It will take

years to wipe out the consequences of de-controlling the industry," and immediately contradicts that by adding, "I am not a pessimist. I am certain we will come out of the present position within the next year." He also told the Conference: "While we have private enterprise the prosperity of owners and workmen are linked up," and later quotes: "He that owns the means whereby I live owns my life."

Labour power is bought and sold on the market at a price which has for its basis the socially necessary labour required for its production. The price of labour power is arrived at by bargaining, and as the capitalist is in possession of the means of production, it is obvious that he is enabled to dictate, within limits, to the seller of labour-power.

But Smith, who says the prosperity of the workers is linked up with that of the capitalists, would have the workers give up the struggle, suggesting the fallacy that the employers would pay on a generous scale in accordance with their prosperity. Smith tries to make the best of a bad business, but not having the lawyerlike mentality of his colleague Hodges, his efforts are too apparent; he reminds one of the old man who had discussed everything from a doleful standpoint, explaining finally to his listener that "he was not a pessimist because he could not see anything to be optimistic about."

Smith goes one better. He tells the doleful tale, but tells it cheerfully, defying all logic and correct conclusions. He congratulates the Federation on its position, although there are more than one hundred

thousand drawing unemployment pay, in addition to the large number wrongfully disqualified from benefits. The disqualified are the victimised men whom the Miners' Federation of Great Britain have not been able to get reinstated since the "settlement" by the precious "agreement" which the E.C. of the Miners' Federation made for the miners.

Still looking for the bright side, Mr. Smith remarks, "Had it not been for the clause in the agreement which provides that a wage of 20 per cent. in excess of wages paid in July, 1914, many of the districts would have been still worse off." His optimism knows no limits, for though the 20 per cent. may be given, the cost of living is 80 per cent. above July, 1914.

That the coal owners refuse to recognise the clause in the agreement, as every district agent and the E.C. of the Miners' Federation must know, for those men who ask for the "minimum wage" risk the sack; their places can be filled by others outside the gates. This deters many, as they, quite naturally, desire to handle some wages in preference to unemployment benefit or Poor Law relief.

That the owners dodge the clause is borne out by Hodges in the *Daily News*, June 9th, 1922:—

"Many instances are occurring where employers, presumably (italics mine) unable to pay the district rates, are stopping the collieries and intimating to the workmen that they can resume employment if they accept lesser wages than their neighbours."

Hodges is always ready to "presume" that the employers are unable to make their collieries pay, for during the lock-out of last year he was more concerned in devising schemes for the employers, and side-tracking the workers from the real issue, which was a question of wages.

The miners have spent money on giving Hodges an education which they thought would be useful to them in their struggles with their masters. It is money that has been badly spent if the only use of the knowledge he is credited with is to "presume" what the capitalist class want the workers to think, that is, employers are "unable to pay the district rates," and the only way to employment is for the workers to "accept lesser wages than their neighbours."

To return to Mr. Smith. He must know that the employers have treated every plea

which has been made to them with contempt, for they knew that the miners were not able to contest another struggle for some time. They have refused to re-employ those they thought undesirable, and refused to make the men's wages up to the minimum when asked by the workers. There seems to be but one object throughout the whole of his speech, that is to make it appear that the so-called agreement is working out favourably to the miners, but these know that, in the words of Hodges, "the British famine has begun," for hundreds of thousands have felt its worst effects during the months after the "settlement."

After some platitudes on the "great boon and blessing of the seven-hour day" (a boon and blessing which has not injured the coal owners, in so far as output is maintained). Smith urges the miners to greater efforts.

"It is now known that providing we had the trade we could, with proper internal organisation and a more extensive use of scientific methods, not only maintain the pre-war output per man, but increase the aggregate output produced in 1913."

Here we find him playing the role of all "leaders," assuring the capitalists that they will get the workers to produce more so that the British capitalists will be able, more effectually, to compete in the scramble for trade. Their most formidable competitor, America, is now engaged in capturing the coal markets of the world. Dr. H. M. Payne, in the *Colliery Guardian*, December 2nd, 1921, stated that the productive capacity of the coal miners of the United States was 700,000,000 tons per year, and the normal consumption 500,000,000 tons per year; thus a well regulated market would provide an outlet for a surplus of 200,000,000. The *Colliery Guardian*, in reporting Dr. Payne's address, says: "He spoke of a remarkable analogy between the position here and in America regarding railway rates and other factors," and continuing: "They must above all concentrate on the labour factor both on the railways and in the mines." The American capitalists are concentrating on the "labour factor," as can be seen by the struggle now taking place between the miners and their employers; the latter with the help of the prototypes of Smith and Hodges will

soon be in an even better position than before to compete for trade, for the intention is to bring lower still the cost of production of coal.

The Socialist is continually pointing out to the working class that the interests their leaders serve when they tell us to produce more are the capitalists interests, whether advocated in ignorance or with full knowledge of the effect does not matter, for as a rule the more the workers produce the sooner are they unemployed.

Apparently Smith is ignorant of this, but it is very difficult to believe that is the case, since he tells us: "The American miner has never been fully employed; even last year they had to play 139 days out of a possible 308, owing to the output being in excess of the demand."

Fellow miners, it can be seen that greater output is not for your benefit, and is not your problem, for in America the miners produce a surplus which is nearly as much as the total amount of coal produced in this country, and yet are out of work 139 days in the year.

More than 100,000 miners are unemployed in England. "A more extensive use of scientific methods" will increase their numbers, and those employed will be worn out more quickly, all in order that our masters may reap trade and profits.

Is it not time you looked into the condition under which you live? Only when you do so, will you be on the way towards understanding your present function in society, and the outcome of such knowledge will be a revolutionary attitude towards your exploiters and their system. You will no longer look to leaders; it will be clear that your interests and the capitalist's can never be reconciled.

Under capitalism every improvement in the methods of production tends to worsen the workers conditions; the tools producing wealth in abundance become a menace and a terror to them.

Within capitalism there is no remedy. When the workers understand the position they will capture the political machine, and use it as an agent of their emancipation, and make all the means whereby society has to live the property of the whole of society.

The machines that to-day are a menace

to the happiness of countless millions will then be the means by which all shall attain leisure and happiness.

J. M. D.

THE RATE OF EXCHANGE.

Dear Comrade,

How many who read the daily paper understand the financial column?

For instance:—Paris, 54.30, Aug. 4th; 54.37, Aug. 5th; Madrid, 28.67, Aug. 4th, and so on. Do you think it could be printed in the *Socialist Standard* so as to make it clear to the average man.—Yours,

G. F. HART.

ANSWER TO HART.

The basis of the figures—known as the rate of exchange—given by Mr. Hart may be stated as follows:—When two countries enter into commercial relations and exchange goods, the prices of these goods are balanced against each other, mainly through the medium of Bills of Exchange. In practice over any financial period, such as three or six months, it will usually be found that one country has sent goods whose prices total more than the prices of the goods it has received. Under ordinary circumstances this difference is settled by the other country sending gold equal to the amount of the debt. The costs of transporting this gold, including insurance, etc., will be the basic cause of the difference in the rate of exchange.

If, for example, a balance were due to England from France, and assuming that 50 francs were equal to a sovereign; that a sovereign equalled $\frac{1}{4}$ oz. of gold; and that the cost of transporting gold, including insurance, etc., were 20 centimes (roughly a 1d.) per oz., then the rate of exchange for that day would be, approximately, 50.05 francs to the pound. The number of bills available, the state of credit between the various merchants, the manner in which a particular government has honoured—or otherwise—its debts, would all have an influence on these figures, which often vary from day to day, and sometimes during the same day, but the basic factor would be as outlined above.

Ed. Com.

JOTTINGS.

Quite recently an application was made on behalf of the Secretary for War, at Lambeth County Court, for an ejectment order against James Leach, an ex-soldier, from rooms occupied by him and his family in married men's quarters.

The following interesting conversation took place in Court:—

Judge Parry asked "Can the court eject a man from barracks?"

Mr. C. Davies (for the application): "It has always been done."

Judge Parry: "Are the authorities not capable of turning this man out?"

Mr. C. Davies: "The Secretary for War does not want to use Prussian methods."

Judge Parry: "He brings to this Court a nasty job which he can do himself."

Judge Parry made an order by consent for possession in a month, and gave judgment for £6 18s. rent, with costs.—*Daily Mail*, April 26th, 1922.

What a piece of hypocrisy! A puzzle!

What is the difference between the "Prussian" methods of ejectment by the Secretary for War and the ejectment order of Judge Parry?

Any reader correctly answering same will be asked to contribute to the £1,000 Fund.

* * *

The first week in September a postal strike was declared in Ireland against a proposed reduction in wages.

The Irish Government showed themselves to be the same as all other capitalist governments when their interests are threatened.

The following was culled from the *Evening News*, September 11th, 1922:—

"Free State troops to-day dispersed strike pickets outside postal offices in Dublin by firing over their heads. This is in accordance with the Government's announcement that the postal strike, which began at 6 yesterday evening, is illegal and that picketing will be suppressed. The strike is against a proposed 'cut' in wages."

The workers in Ireland have the same lesson to learn as the workers of all countries, i.e.: That not until they recognise there is a class-struggle in Society born of the private ownership of the means of life, and that Socialism is their hope, can there be any improvement in their wretched conditions.

* * *

"Our bitter experience has proved that it is not Germany that is paying. It is the British working man who is paying at this moment."

This statement, made by J. H. Thomas,

M.P., was loudly cheered at the Trade Union Congress at Southport to-day.—*Evening News*, September 5th, 1922.

How often have readers of the S.S. heard the above statement made from the platforms of the pseudo-socialist parties and met it in their press? By a mere superficial examination of the above, it undoubtedly appears to be correct. But when a thinking worker analyses the assertion, he will quite easily see how unsound J.H.T.'s economics really are. Doubtless, Thomas, like many thousands of workers, think that because the workers are the wealth producers of the world, they must of necessity pay for everything. That only shows "loose" thinking, a failure to understand correctly capitalist wealth production.

* * *

One statement in the election address of the "revolutionary" Mayor of Bethnal Green during the last L.C.C. election was as follows:—

"We maintain that unemployment is a NATIONAL and not a local problem, and if returned to the L.C.C. will do all in our power to force the Government to provide work or accept financial responsibility for unemployment. Further, we pledge ourselves to do all in our power to push forward the L.C.C.'s own schemes of work so as to absorb the unemployed. If you want the opportunity to work: Vote for Valentine and Vaughan."

Could anyone but a place-hunter spread broadcast such rubbish and still claim to be a Socialist? Sorry, Mr. Printer, he's a Communist! Every line in the above statement is sheer bunkum. Quite apart from the fact that unemployment is not a national problem, even if Vaughan and his clique were in the majority on the L.C.C. it would not be possible for them to provide schemes to absorb the unemployed.

Not all the schemes, plans and efforts of all the reformers can remove the canker of unemployment and its concomitant evils; not until the workers are fully conscious of the fact that the private property basis of society must be swept aside, to make way for the common ownership and democratic control of the means of living.

THE SETTLER.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.

Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

THE WAY OF PEACE.

Such was the alluring title of an article published in the *Daily News*, dated July 31st, 1922, in which the writer showed a subtle ability of propounding views which help to keep the workers from grasping the real significance of hero worship. To contend that they who demonstrated at the Cenotaph in Whitehall by dipping their banners as they passed, or laid flowers at the base of the monument, were actuated by the desire to pay homage to the fallen in war; and to describe it as a "silent and impressive pledge to the dead," is but sentimental humbug; for those to whom the pledge is stated to have been made, care nothing for such promises, and certainly will in nowise be offended if they are not carried into effect. The eyes of the dead are closed for ever, and weary not for the hypocritical promises made in their name. However easy it is to escape the responsibility of a promise to the dead, you cannot deceive them; but it is possible to deceive the living by lugubrious protestations over the dead and impress them that some benefit may be derived from their mournful pretensions.

Sorrow for departed friends will always persist, and people will continue to demonstrate their regret in various ways long after their friends de cease. Those who went to the Cenotaph with honest motives were of this kind, and relieved their emotions publicly because "knowing not where they have laid him" they cannot do so privately as they would if death had been the result of disease and been followed by an ordinary funeral, and the remains deposited in a place easy of access. Others were there who totally lacked that spirit of thoroughness which we call principle, indifferent to all else except spectacular effect, who would sooner see a man dive to death from the top of St. Paul's, than go to the poll and vote their slavery away. But a more sinister motive lies behind these officially organised demonstrations of pretended reverence for those who fell in the war; and that is to inculcate and keep alive the thought that they died in a glorious struggle to ensure eternal peace to posterity and willingly made the supreme sacrifice. Once get that idea into the noddles of those who are maturing unto military age, how much easier it will be to recruit the forces required by the capitalists for the next last great war to end war.

Already on to-night's placards I find they are calling 'em up.

It may be useful to remember that during the great war of 1914-1918, the workers who were drawn into that bloody orgie wanted nothing more than to be allowed to remain in their native land, and to be provided with a constant means of obtaining a living by the sale of their labour power to the master-class. That is the high watermark of their intelligence, which socialists so much deplore; but to say nations are torn with suspicions of each other, or secretly preparing war-like plans of self-aggrandisement, etc., is a travesty of facts, or the result of lamentable ignorance. It is not the nations, but the greedy capitalist class whose sectional interests compel them to regard each other suspiciously and who are secretly preparing to commit another terrible crime against humanity. The great mass of the world's workers know nothing of these plans, and instead of suspicion there is an ever-growing sympathy springing up between them: a sympathy born of the knowledge that there is only one enemy they have to face the wide world over:—the capitalist class who alone are responsible for the present economic chaos, and the sum of human misery and suffering entailed thereby.

Many workers of all nationalities who have passed through worse than death, now realise that the cult of nationalism is indeed a tragic futility so far as the working-class are concerned; and the spirit of international co-operation and solidarity, though slowly, is surely growing up amongst them, born of the knowledge that they are poor because the greater part of the wealth they bring into existence is robbed from them by the capitalist-class. To his everlasting credit, Karl Marx made this clear, and explained the process of the robbery in *Capital*, in which the true nature of capitalism is revealed as resting upon the exploitation of the working-class through individual or private ownership of the means of producing the necessities of life. This divides society into two distinct classes whose interests are as widely opposed as the two poles of the earth: one a propertyless class having nothing to sell but its power to labour; the other a wealthy class owning the means of wealth production. Amongst the latter there is continual friction arising out of the competition for markets for the sale of com-

modities, each section trying to oust the other. World-wide territories are examined, trade routes determined, and all the machinery put into operation to secure a profitable sale; and a very watchful eye is kept by their respective governments upon the interests of those whom they represent. When these interests are threatened by trade rivalry of another state, bombing machines, gun-boats and troops are hurried to Tom Tiddler's ground to administer a gentle admonition to the offending party. All of which goes to prove there can be no peace, in either a military or economic sense, while goods are made for profit instead of use, and exploitation of the working-class forms the basis of society.

I once heard the House of Commons described as the Thieves' Kitchen, and in my opinion that term is not less applicable to the League of Nations to which the *Daily News* pins its faith; for what else is it, but a consultative body of capitalists which meets for the purpose of determining the most economical way of appropriating the result of working-class effort and apportioning shares of the spoil to the various capitalist sections whom they represent.

It follows then, as the day follows night, that if we would do away with war, we must destroy the conditions from which it arises. Not patch up or reform the old structure, but change the system entirely by doing away with wagedom and capitalism, and substitute a system of society in which the whole of the means of social production is commonly owned and democratically controlled in the interest of all. Then it will be impossible for anyone to deprive another of existence by withholding the means of satisfying his requirements.

In this way alone lies the path to peace. After all it is not in the power of statesmen to end war as they belong to the class to whom war is necessary and inevitable, and cannot but desire a continuance of a system that gives them such ease and enjoyment.

The workers alone can alter the circumstances that bring such untold misery and ruin to their homes, by organising for the complete overthrow of the wage system. Then only can there be Peace throughout the world. How this is to be done will be found in our declaration of principles on the back of this paper. Read, mark and inwardly digest them. W. W. F.

ANSWER TO J. BLUNDELL.

In regard to their general results "Inflation" and "Debasing" of the currency are the same, though the terms are generally used with reference to two different kinds of currency. "Inflation" is used in connection with a paper currency, and "Debasing" in connection with a metallic one.

When first established the coins of a metallic currency were worth—or were of the value—of their face denomination—Pound, penny, etc. Some of the old rulers tried to rob their subjects by using inferior metal in the manufacture of the coins, or by issuing coins under the legally fixed weight. In either case the difference in value between the original coins and the altered or "Debased" ones, would form a margin for the rulers' benefit until the debasement was discovered and new higher prices established in line with the lower real value of the new coins.

In the case of a country with an inconvertible paper currency—inflation, of course cannot take place where the paper is convertible into gold upon demand—the purchasing point at which the paper will circulate depends upon how much "foreign" trade is carried on by the country in question, and the amount of notes issued compared with the estimate, made by the trading community, of the power and willingness of the Government to meet its liabilities, or, in other words, upon the "credit" of that particular government.

Should the Government issue notes in excess of this "credit" the notes would circulate at a point below their face denomination in the proportion of the "over-issue." The "over-issue" would be termed "inflation," as the notes would have been issued in numbers beyond their legitimate sphere. Poland and Austria are extreme examples of such "inflation."

Ed. Com.

RIP VAN WINKLE.

Dear Sirs,—

Re your reply to my letter, I hardly think it meets the case. The fact of new people developing capitalism does not alter the fact that it is possible for a country to acquire means whereby it can escape going through all the stages of capitalism. You half admit this yourself, for your assumption

tion that the Russian people would not keep abreast with Western development is not in accordance with facts. For instance, the rapid growth of capitalism in Japan is an instance of how a backward people can acquire proficiency regarding the manipulation of modern means of production. We must understand that the Bolsheviks holding political power are in the position of giving their people full scope for development. It is not necessary for a person to fully understand a machine before he is capable of operating it. Regarding the *S.P.G.B. Standard*—what I meant was that it was not necessary for a people as a whole to be capable of understanding Marxian Economics. That is why I quoted the passage from the preface to the "Critique." The passage precedes the one over which Mr. Dight first crossed swords with you. The passage following is also illuminating. It runs as follows:—"Therefore mankind always takes up such problems as it can solve; since looking at the matter more closely we will always find that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions necessary for its solution already exist, or are at least in the process of formation." Now I claim that the Russian Bolsheviks were justified in seizing power and attempting to establish Communism, since it seems clear to me that it is possible by importing modern means of production into the country of at least escaping the worst of capitalist development. If I am wrong, I would like to be put on the right track. I asked you to explain the passage I quoted from the "Critique." You declined, brushing it aside, saying that it did not require interpretation; I asked because I put a certain construction on it that you might think wrong, and I require information which you did not give. My interpretation is briefly this:—That Marx foresaw a seizing of power by the intelligent section of the community, backed by the unrest and misery of the workers on the breakdown, partial or complete, of a preceding system. Where he says—"and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic—in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out," it strengthens the idea that despite a changed economic foundation, a great bulk of the people would not have an ideology in keeping with the change. He points out that

"the distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production." Briefly, this is my construction, and I think that it is also the construction of the Russian Bolsheviks. I again ask you for your interpretation. Regarding my "astounding blindness," it still remains, that whichever country or countries subsidised the buccaneering expeditions into Russia, it was always with the purpose of overthrowing the Bolsheviks, for they all realised, if J.F. does not, that they had little hope of fleecing the workers of Russia whilst the Bolsheviks held power; so I do not see the refutation or answer to the latter part of my letter.

One more point I would like to ask. In the reply to Mr. Dight, J.F. says there is no race or nation of people that have passed from feudalism to fully developed capitalism without going through the essential phases of capitalist developments. Will J.F. kindly explain what he means "by the essential phases of capitalism."

Yours fraternally,

D. S. O. MAHONEY.

REPLY.

When a correspondent sends any question to the *Socialist Standard*, the facts and arguments in support of our case are put forward in the simplest language, consistent with accuracy, at our command. If such a presentation of our case fails to reach the understanding of the questioner, it is evidently useless to carry the discussion any further.

All the points given in Mr. Mahoney's letter have been answered in various articles in the *Socialist Standard*, and were specifically dealt with in the answer to his previous letter in the August (1922) issue.

Mr. Mahoney admits that he still fails to understand that the most colossal war in human history was not between two nations at different economic stages, but between two whose stage of development and economic conditions were practically identical. In the face of such a mentality, it would be a waste of time and space to deal with his other statements.

Ed. Com.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. 3s. 0d.
Six Months, post free .. 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard.

OCTOBER



1922

THE CALL OF THE GRAVEYARD.

The "war to end wars" is still going strong. Eight years ago this peculiar brand of wars was going to finish in a few weeks. Four years later we were told that the fearful enemy that had been menacing the peace of Europe had been whacked. There was great jubilation in the tents of the mighty. A short time after, however, the whackers discovered that it was they who had been whacked. Much talk there was about the wheels of industry that would not move; much mystery and puzzlement over the movements of foreign exchanges; and finally weird and wonderful theories of currency. Tearfully the capitalists' leader writers complained of the black outlook after all the treasure spent, and all the property destroyed. The allies had gleefully arranged how the war indemnity was to be split up amongst them, and afterwards discovered that they had so successfully busted the enemy that he could not pay. Then there was a wild scramble to raise up the fallen enemy (put their competitor back where he was before they started the busting process!) as he appeared to have fallen on the victors. In the meantime forty or fifty other minor wars were going on in different parts of the world to fill up the interval.

A little later still the different members of

the victorious time discovered that each was pulling a different way, each trying to carve a bumper share out of the alleged spoils on the sly.

There were many portentous conferences, much trumpet blowing and raising of smoke screens. So avaricious were the "peace-makers" that the period of conferences bid fair to be infinite. While this hubbub was going on one that was so lately a fallen enemy rose up again, and while the "faithful" allies, without even the staunchness generally attributed to thieves, were following each his own course in backing this fallen enemy or his opponent a new apparition has appeared to haunt Europe in the person of the "victorious Turk." So the wheels of the "war to end wars" are kept merrily turning.

With unconscious humour the *Daily News* (19th September, 1922), exhibits on its front page a picture to stiffen the backs of future war heroes. It is a pleasant picture; the picture of a portion of the Anzac cemetery at Ari Burnu, on the Gallipoli Peninsula, where, they state, 20,000 British and Australian soldiers are lying! Are they offering a solution of the unemployed problem? Or are they offering the Anzacs a "home from home?" How anxious our masters must think we are to enter the eternal silence of the tomb! Funny, isn't it?

In the editorial column of the same paper, same date, there are some other funny things. For example, we read: "Which is the better way of preventing a war—to keep Kemal's army on the Asiatic side and call a conference to consider his claims, or to give it free passage and leave it to stake out its own claims by force?"

Here we have a capitalist definition of "preventing a war"—to prevent war go for the other chap first; it isn't a war then its a defensive action! Quite obvious, isn't it?

In the meantime what has become of the wonderful "League of Nations" that was floated with such a flourish of trumpets? It appears to have quietly stepped off the stage (referred the matter to a committee!) its services being no longer required now that arrangements have been made to refloat the war enterprise on the grand scale.

To work up our feelings over "small nationalities" and similar sacred matters we are kept informed of the alleged atrocities

of the Turks some hundreds of miles away. In the meantime, however, there has been a mining disaster in the North of England not many days ago, and many workmen lost their lives; further, we read daily of men, women and children being run over and killed by the motor cars that hurry the wealthy from pleasure to pleasure. Atrocities are not confined exclusively to wars; they also flourish abundantly where peace is supposed to reign.

This brings us to the main point. What does it matter to the world's workers what group of capitalists control the sources of wealth? An exchange of masters is of no practical account to the world's workers. The point is they are all members of the capitalist class.

Therefore the fresh stir up in Europe should not concern working men at all except as another instance of the cupidity and trickery of their masters.

On the page of the *Daily News* that contains the invigorating picture of the graveyard we read that Lloyd George sent a telegram to the Prime Ministers of Australia and New Zealand containing the following:

"Your prompt response to our inquiry regarding troops to resist any threat against freedom of Straits and sanctity of Gallipoli Peninsula received here with enthusiasm."

Who were the enthusiasts? Those who were going to direct the war evidently, as they were the only ones who knew anything about it. Anyhow, it wasn't the prospective candidates for the vacancies in the cemetery; they are too busy discussing the wage cuts—the reward for their so recently suspended activities in the shambles.

STEPS TO SOCIALISM.

Dear Sir,

I should be glad if you would state upon what "lines" you consider Socialism will be achieved? Could you tell me, as nearly as possible, the successive steps by which the working class will overthrow the existing order, and how the means of life will be distributed when the workers have conquered the powers of government, national and local?

(It is argued in Communistic quarters that the officers of the army, navy, etc., would refuse to obey a working-class Parliament, by the way.)

Perhaps you would be good enough to show, for example, how the raw materials for clothing and housing would be obtained and manufactured, and made available for members of Socialist Society.

I am, yours faithfully,

J. C. C.

ANSWER TO J. C. C.

To attempt a forecast of the details of a social revolution would be a waste of time. A little thought will show that such details will be decided by the conditions existing at the time of the revolution. As it is impossible to forecast the date of the revolution, evidently it is impossible to know in detail the conditions that will prevail then. The general lines of the change are more easy to define, because the general conditions are known:—

(1) As the centre of power is Parliament, and members of that body are returned by the votes of the working class, it is quite clear that the first step is the conversion of a majority of the voters to a recognition of the need for the establishment of Socialism.

(2) The next step is the organisation of that majority into a political party for the purpose of returning delegates into control of Parliament.

(3) The Socialists, being in a majority, would pass laws for the purpose of converting the great means of wealth production and distribution into social—or common—property.

(4) If necessary force will be used to carry out these laws, but this use will depend not upon the socialists, but upon the capitalists, who may turn rebels against society and law.

The raw materials would be obtained by setting men and women to work for that purpose. An illustration, though perhaps not a very good one—was the action of the Government in taking control of materials during the war. Distribution would be according to the needs of the members of society, the details being dependent upon conditions at that time.

The statement of the Communists that officers of the army and navy would refuse to obey orders is a sheer assumption, and no evidence has ever been brought forward to support that statement.

Ed. Com.

A WORD ON ORGANISATION.

An organ is something that works. Organisation is the assembling and arranging of the parts of a compound body in a manner for use; that is to say, that each part may co-operate with the others to a given end, the whole working as one organ. A tree, with its multitude of diverse cells, is an example of exquisite organisation.

In the same way, when men and women organise themselves they are proceeding to *work together*, with an agreed objective. They are forming a single body, of which each individual is a part; and should any part deviate to pursue some different plan, the advance of the whole will be hindered by just so much. The body may be very small, or it may be immense; the same remains true.

When a man joins a party, therefore, he automatically proclaims himself as in agreement with its declared aims. No amount of disclaimer or qualification does away with this fact. The outsider assumes, and is justified in assuming, that the aims of the party represent his ideas. The members expect, and have a right to expect, that he will conform at all points to its principles. Why else is he there? If, once admitted, he proceeds to advocate principles which do not agree with those of the party, the members will only act consistently in expelling him. The inside of the party is not the place for such an advocacy, and the application for membership was a ruse: he did not join for the purpose of working with others for an agreed object. Moreover, the outsider has good reason for not attending to his message, since he proclaims one thing in his words and another by his actions. What is true of the individual in relation to parties, is true of parties in relation to federations.

The application of this? The S.P.G.B. is sometimes asked why it does not seek affiliation with other bodies professing themselves socialist or labour. The foregoing is one reason, and in itself would be sufficient. The programmes and actions of these various parties have been frequently examined in the pages of the *Standard*. None of them agree with our idea of socialist principle. Therefore affiliation, if obtained, would be unfair to their members, confusing to those outside.

The other reason is that the movement

towards working-class emancipation would not be strengthened thereby. We want the greatest possible number of our fellow workers with us; but purely formal organisation is useless in any sphere of action. Organisation must be the expression of a real unity of purpose, whether the purpose be the felling of a tree or the building of a new society. The more momentous the work, the more important it is to remember this. In the case of the class war, formal unity is worse than useless. It is a pretence and a danger. If it were possible to form a vast and disciplined organisation of workers with their present degree of class-consciousness, it would be but a more convenient instrument of exploitation for the master-class. In short, organisation must follow education, not precede it.

This is true alike on the industrial and political fields. In industry we workers must learn the meaning of the tasks which emerge in the daily fight over conditions of labour. That we cannot hope to placate the exploiter, nor look for impartial arbitration. That we have to expect capitalist aggression—with fleeting exceptions, progressively more vigorous every year. That we have but one weapon on this field, the strike, and even that will fail us whenever the master-class decides to fight an issue out. That to make the best use of the strike we must have, not many unions for one industry, nor one for each industry, nor even one for each national group—but a world-wide workers' union. And that this day to day struggle must be waged, not for us by leaders, but by us through delegates.

We shall not have advanced far on this road to industrial solidarity before we are forced to see that the utmost we can do by these means is to resist attacks on our already poor standard of living. We cannot improve our standard to any appreciable extent, much less entirely free ourselves from exploitation. To do this we must take the vast machinery of production into our own hands. And since this is an issue which our masters decidedly *would* fight if they could, we realise that direct action on the industrial field will no longer suffice for us. We do not intend that the capitalists shall be able to starve us by commandeering the food supply, nor slaughter us by using the army and police. While we hope that in that day our fellow-workers in the armed

forces will be with us—while we are going to do our utmost to make them so—we do not mean to take risks by allowing the capitalist class to give them orders. We find that we need political power. We need an assembly of workers' delegates, with a mandate for socialism; and we organise in the Socialist Party with the object of getting it.

Thus our industrial and political activities must be two sides of one movement: the industrial for safeguarding conditions within the capitalist system, and probably forming the basis for the industrial organisation of the Socialist Commonwealth; the political for the expropriation of expropriators.

These things we have to learn, and only on the basis of this knowledge can organisation proceed.

A.

THE OTHER EDEN.

"The historic mansion known as York House, Twickenham, is being offered for sale by private treaty. . . . Lady Ratan Tata now finds it larger than her requirements, and hence it is in the market. The estate contains eight acres of grounds, surrounded by a high brick wall, with rose garden, Japanese garden, and lawns and terraces by the river. The grounds boast a cascade lit by electric light and ornamented by groups of marble statuary. Opposite to the terrace and boathouse is the east end of Eel Pie Island, which is part of the Property."—*Star*.

Newport, Monmouth, Trades Council has conducted an enquiry into local housing conditions.

"One case of which it has cognisance is that of a widow whose husband was killed in the war. The only sleeping accommodation she can find is in the same room with two youths, aged 17 and 16 respectively, who are not related to her."—*Daily Herald*.

"Accompanied by her husband the Princess (Mary) spent a long time inspecting the new hunt kennels at Hope Hall, where there is excellent stabling for 32 horses and accommodation for upwards of 60 couples of hounds."—*Daily Chronicle*.

"Another case is that of a house in Shaftesbury Street, where four families occupy five rooms. One of the mothers was recently confined, and had five children in her only room. She is now housing a terrier, because during her confinement she was attacked by rats."—*Daily Herald*.

"Lord and Lady Cable have arrived at Evian-les-Bains for the cure, after a delightful tour in Normandy, where they visited many beauty spots and places of historic interest. . . . When her health permits, Lady Cable entertains at 44, Grosvenor Square, and at her beautiful place in Devon."—*Daily Chronicle*.

"A young man named Mullin, charged at Manchester with stealing coal from the Midland Railway Company's sidings at Belle Vue, said that his father was in hospital, his mother ill at home, and he and his two sisters were out of work. There was only fifteen shillings a week coming into the house.

"The Magistrate: But you were here two years ago for a similar offence, and let off with a caution. You must have known that if you came here again you probably would have to go to prison.

"Mullin (in tears): I did know it, but I could not bear to see how things were going at home, with no fire and hardly any food.

"A police officer said that Mullin's story was true. The case was adjourned for three months to see if Mullin would keep a promise to enlist."—*Westminster Gazette*.

Well, fellow-workers, WHAT ABOUT IT?

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE
S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1

THE BROOM.

"Those who opposed it on 'principle' [the tactic of seeking affiliation with the Labour Party]—(in reality because they just cannot stand the Hendersons and MacDonalds . . .)—who prefer to carry on their 'revolutionary activities' far from the madding crowd . . . are happily not in our ranks. On their banners the word 'purity' is writ in large letters, and over it a dainty broom as a warning. Alas, they have failed to understand that only the newly-born are pure; that in order to become pure again, we must go through purgatory. . . . If the present trade unions are hells we have simply got to go through it—not save our souls by running away to start unions of our own. If the local labour party is a hell we have got to go through it, and so with the National Labour Party." (The Communist).

The supreme desire of the Socialist is for the triumph of his cause. His heart is "scared with the knowledge of preventable human woe"; his dreams are bright with the possibilities of the future commonwealth. His ambitions are no longer individual, nor are his joys and sorrows. He is glad and downcast with the flow and ebb of the movement. He views events in their relation to the revolution; he asks of institutions whether they can assist or only obstruct it. The needs of the cause are imperative calls, the advantage of the cause is his highest expediency.

He knows that the revolution is no one's business but the workers; and therefore asks himself, "Is our class to-day, generally speaking, ready for such a step?" It is not. We are not even capable of fighting with any degree of success the everyday battles of industry. In the perennial struggle around conditions of livelihood we suffer defeat on defeat; worse, we combat one another. We allow ourselves to be divided on all manner of pretexts. We have not learned to unite even in defence of the meagre things we have. As to completely re-organising social life, we should call the suggestion madness. Send our masters packing—why, who would pay our wages? Produce and distribute by democratic arrangement—the work would never get done. Claim and receive what we need from the common store—why, we do not even laugh at the idea. It lies outside our imagination.

The present order of things suits us very well; only we should all like to be kept in work, draw higher wages, and pay less rent.

Such being the state of mind of those whose mission it is to overthrow capitalism, the Socialist and his comrades buckle down to their task. They may do one of two things: *lead* the workers or *teach* them. That is to say, they may select a non-revolutionary political party which at the moment has the favour of the workers, and associate themselves with it, regardless of whether its activities are in themselves an advance toward revolution. By zeal and devotion they may aim at acquiring a strong influence with the members, so that when decisions are to be taken their advice will be asked and followed, even though the members are not convinced Socialists. This does not mean that they will neglect to teach socialism, but that they are prepared to attempt a revolution, relying for support on people who better understand the efficiency of Socialists than the full meaning of Socialism. On the other hand, they may devote *all* their energies to education, assisting no reformist activity, but rather making clear the worthlessness of such endeavours, and the true remedy for the distress which gave rise to them. In this case the minimum prerequisite of a seizure of political power would be a majority of Socialists. That is not to say that the majority need be profound Marxian scholars, but they must (1) understand well the basic principles of capitalist and socialist society respectively; (2) have freely decided to destroy the one and set up the other; and consequently be able (3) intelligently to exercise the right of recall, if any of those whom they depute to give effect to their will shall seek to play them false; or (4) to appoint suitable successors if chance should remove some of their delegates, so that the direction of the revolution is in nowise accidental.

In other words, Socialists may either act for their fellow-workers, making all efforts meanwhile to bring them into line, or they may concentrate on making them capable of acting for themselves. The method of leadership recommends itself to some, because it appears at first sight to be the quicker. Naturally no Socialist is willing to defer the revolution a year—a day—beyond what is necessary. In face of capitalism's terrible daily waste of human life

and happiness; with men and women dying every hour, worn out at an age when they ought to be enjoying their full powers of mind and body; with babies born every hour into such conditions that they can only become grotesque caricatures of humanity; what Socialist would not be impatient? Walk round Bermondsey, look out as your train runs into Bristol, or make a tour of a Lancashire mill, and see whether you can feel patient about the last years of capitalism! It is all too easy to understand men like Martin Nexö's anarchist character, who was so obsessed by the suffering of his neighbours that he threw away his life in a futile attempt to effect an immediate remedy. There is not a Socialist who does not desire the transformation tomorrow, if that were possible.

But what would be the outcome of a revolutionary venture employing the method of leadership—such an attempt as Engels criticised—"carried out by small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses?"

To count on the support of people who do not understand your purpose is to build your house on the sand. At your most need they may desert you. If they can be influenced by you, they may be by your enemies too; and, in the hardships and uncertainties of the transition period, will they not be fruitful ground for the seeds of counter-revolution? Moreover, if you surmount the first dangers, are these the men and women successfully to work a socialist system of industry? Accustomed to leaders, how shall they show the qualities necessary for democratic control—the independence, the responsibility? Not understanding how the system should develop, where is the safeguard against their wrecking it by unsound decisions? And if to prevent that you must govern your fellow-workers after all, what is it you have established? Not a co-operative commonwealth, but a bureaucratic state—a sorry achievement of leadership, which leaves the task of education still before you.

For this reason, believing that no genuine and enduring transformation of society is possible until the majority of the workers have embraced socialist principles, the S.P.G.B. directs all its actions towards organising an evergrowing body of socialist conviction. It takes no part in reformist agitation, but calls on the workers to come

together for the one action that can help them. *Nor does it by keeping its independence lack opportunities of reaching the workers.* Men and women are not confined to barracks labelled Labour Party, National Unemployed Workers' Committee, and so on, and only approachable through those doors. They may be members of these organisations, yet none the less exposed to our socialist bombardment, in the workshop, the trade union branch, at the street corner, in the parks. We do not lack opportunities for propaganda; but we do avoid confusing our message, as we should confuse it by advocating socialist principles with our lips and supporting reformist programmes by our actions. We seek to ensure that new comrades join us with their eyes wide open—knowing the road without need of a leader. Such a party is framed to triumph, because the fabric is sound all through. Say in time of revolution a man is entrusted with a great task. He fails or he dies; it is but to supply his place with another. The revolution will not fail or die with him. All are not equally gifted, but the field of selection is as wide as the party, not limited to a small vanguard.

Leaders, however strong and courageous, cannot guarantee victory, and a defeated insurrection would save despair and defer what it sought to hasten. But a resolute majority, equipped with knowledge, is invincible.

Specific comment on the paragraph at the head of this article is almost redundant. We might perhaps advise our Communist friend not to be mistrustful of principle. It's a good thing to have. Without it he will be only a ship without a helm. Nor be too guilty-conscious of his own fall from grace. However little he may look like a pure revolutionist at present, there is hope for him, though for a member of a relatively "newly-born" party it's rather sad to feel that urgent need of purification. Since he seems to have a fondness for scriptural allusion, we counsel him to strive to become again as a little child in the movement, by discarding the opportunism that has sent him astray. If he *must* have a taste of purgatory, why the preference for the Labour Party? There are the Liberal and Conservative parties too, also supported by the workers, who hoped from each in turn sympathetic attention to their interests. They sent these parties to

power in the hope of something being done for them; they now bid fair to send the Labour Party for no better reason—certainly not because they are determined at last to think and act for themselves.

We like the device of the broom which he inscribes on our banners. We accept and shall use it to sweep the dry leaves from our revolutionary path—daintily for such as he, for that is all that is necessary; but for our enemies, with a stroke that shall hum across the world.

A.

"LIEPOCRACY."

Certain writers in the capitalist press are telling us that Bottomley was a canting hypocrite. What a study for the cynical philosopher? This erstwhile defender and champion of capitalism is now "down and out," he therefore better than any other can be used as a scapegoat, a means to delude the working-class into the belief that the methods he employed were unusual, were contemptible, and therefore to be condemned. Was Bottomley, during the war, with his highly paid patriotic speeches, a greater hypocrite than his satellite recruiting sergeant, Ben Tillett? Was Lloyd George with his "Land Fit for Heroes" make-believe, or Asquith unsheathing the sword and spending his last shilling less despicable? They knew that they lied, that their words were dope for war victims. What of the flood of nauseating hypocrisy that is launched during a strike, the tears of anguish from the smug and complacent fat bellies for the consequently suffering women and children; even while the same gang at the same time, fight bitterly to reduce the workers to the lowest possible standard of subsistence consistent with the maximum output of wealth. What is all the lying pretence and the soft-soaped promises given to the long-suffering worker at election times by capitalist politician and labour misleader alike, if it is not the quintessence of cant and hypocrisy? The Socialist claims that this insidious form of working-class chloroform is an essential attribute of a now useless and parasitic capitalist class. That they may justify their luxurious and leisured life and your inhuman existence with the consequent antagonism between the two conditions, they pretend sympathy to blur

class cleavage; they buy your votes with honeyed words that you shall give them the power to rule you; they insult you with the return of a little of the wealth you alone of the human factors produce, and call it charity. Though you are the only useful class to-day, you have still to become conscious of the fact. When you understand Socialism you will be PROOF against the cant and humbug of all sections of the capitalist class and their agents, whether it be priest, politician, or pretending sympathiser.

MAC.

£1,000 FUND.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Already Acknowledged	..			848	10	6½
By Donations:—						
Perger, New Zealand	..	2	0			
Dell, Burton-on-Trent	..	2	0			
McCarthy, M/c	..	4	0			
Page, G.	..	5	0			
Mrs C. G.	..	1	0			
Huthwaite, India	..	1	14		7	
"G. H." Plymouth	..	2	6			
Gotz	..	7	2			
Islington Branch	..	1	0			
				4	17	3
By Sale of £1000 Stamps:—						
Book No. 59 (Tottenham)	..	5	0			
" " (Edinburgh)	..	11	0			
" " 47 (Battersea)	..	2	9			
" " 115	..	6	6			
" " 116	..	10	9			
" " 24 (Wood Green)	..	1	0			
" " 25	..	3	0			
" " 113	..	4	0			
" " 134	..	1	6			
" " 97 (Islington)	..	10	0			
" " 101 ("H. G.")	..	1	0			
				3	15	6
By Collections:—						
Walthamstow Branch	..	5	0			
Delegate Meeting	..	11	0			
				16	0	
				£858	2	9½

A.S.C./20:9:22

A Lecture on Socialism and Political Action

will be delivered at

THE TOWN HALL, POPLAR
(Small Hall), Newby Place,

ON

Sunday, 22nd October, 1922

at 7.30 p.m.

Admission Free.

Questions & Discussion.

THE MAN IN THE BACK STREET.

The *Daily News*, of May 16th, 1922, had an interesting editorial on the Rt. Hon. C. F. G. Masterman's article in the same issue, entitled "The Wealth of England." Sentences in the editorial were quite up to the S.S. standard:—"The contrast between the gaudy phantasmagoria of politics and the sordid facts which for the great mass of the people make up life is always there. The politicians talk on interminably of their high matters, determining the fate of great nations, regulating, or affecting to regulate, the courses of trade, composing peroration upon peroration on liberty, or the balance of power, or the honour of the Empire, or whatever other catchword best reflects the mood of the moment. The man in the back street feels no doubt in the end, and indirectly, the result of it all. Directly, it has as much relevance to his thoughts and his feelings, his hopes and his fears, as the road to Mandalay. His concern is to keep a roof over his head, and, if he is lucky enough to have one already, to earn enough money to keep himself and his family in some semblance of comfort; to win, if it may be, some stray glimpse of light and colour in the hard, squalid wilderness of his life. It is easy to rebuke men so situated for 'taking no interest in politics.' So situated, who would? It is easy to charge them with lack of patriotism or indifference to the things that matter. Let the prophets who say these things change places with their victims, and see how much they care for Empires on which the sun never sets in courts to which the sun never penetrates." The *Daily News* see the workers are tired of the old Liberals, and in despair say plain words about the conditions of the working-class. No doubt the *Daily News* would like the workers to vote out the Coalition Government. But there is something deeper that is the cause of this darkness and blight on working-class lives. The capitalist system of wealth production and distribution would keep out the sun and brightness whatever the Government with whatever name you may give it. It tickles us somewhat, when the Editor says, "Let the prophets change places with their victims and see how much they care for Empires, etc." What funny *Daily News* to give us. Surely the changing of places of individuals

would only change the antics of individuals. Mrs. Soapsuds of the back street would surely become Lady Pears, and Mr. Coal-heaver would shine as Lord Hard Nuts? Our cocoa editor—should the Liberals gain office—would get Empire on the brain again. Socialism is the only remedy—and the artfulness of parties out of office helps us to get on with the work—sometimes.

S. W.

MINTED GOLD.

We have received the two following questions from Mr. W. A. Archer:—

(1) Is minted gold, e.g., a sovereign, a commodity within the borders of the nation of issue?

(2) What would be the attitude of the Executive of the S.P.G.B. towards the member of that party who disagreed with the explanation given in reply to question (1)?

REPLY TO W. A. ARCHER.

(1) A sovereign is issued for purposes of currency, under Government control, to ensure that fineness and weight of metal shall be constant in all new coins. To attempt to alter, or interfere, with either the fineness, weight or inscription of such coins is an illegal act. Technically the sovereign can only be used as currency inside the country of issue, and is, therefore, not a commodity.

It is true that on rare occasions jewellers take sovereigns and melt them down for use in their business, to save the time and trouble of assaying gold they might purchase in the ordinary way, but the quantity of sovereigns thus used is extremely small. Moreover, as it is impossible to distinguish minted gold after remelting from any other gold of the same fineness and colour, it is exceedingly difficult to detect such illegal occurrences unless the offender were "caught in the act."

(2) The attitude of the Executive would be to judge any case brought before them on its merits, in the light of the declaration of principles and the constitution of the party.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 8 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spicel-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

DEPTFORD.—Sec., J. Veasey, 24, Marlton-st., E. Greenwich, S.E. 10. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays in month, at 8 o'clock, at 485, New Cross-rd., S.E. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.8. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Andrew Porter, 12a, Kings-rd., Portobello.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at The Arcadians, 42, Amhurst-rd., Hackney Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 3, Lyveden-rd., Tooting, S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays, at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 49, Napier rd., Philip Lane, N.15. Branch meets Fridays, The Trades Hall, 7, Bruce-grove, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays each month at 8 p.m., at Alexandra School, N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
 Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
 Manor Park, Earl of Essex, 7.30 p.m.
 Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 a.m.
 Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
 Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m.
 Walthamstow, Hoe Street Station, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.
 Tottenham, Junction Clyde-road and Phillip-lane, 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.; and
 Printed by R. E. TAYLOR & SON, LTD., 55/57, Banner Street, London, E.C.1. (T.I.).

**THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.****OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE
Socialist Standard
The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 219. Vol 19.]

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

ELECTION MANIFESTO

When, in 1918, the "Hang-the-Kaiser—Make-Germany-Pay" Election was being fought, the S.P.G.B., in their Election Manifesto, warned the workers of the line the development of the then existing conditions would take, and the real reason for an election at that moment.

It was pointed out in the Manifesto that:—

While prices of necessities are still rising thousands of munition workers are being discharged; tens of thousands are working short time, and, according to Lord Curzon, "In a few weeks' time there would be a million of people out of work." And this is only the beginning. Further unemployment is bound to occur while such demobilization as will be carried out will add to the number vainly seeking work. Wages will fall as a result, though prices may remain up for some time, and poverty and misery will increase as a consequence throughout the land.

Before the deluded workers awake to a realisation of how they have been duped, despite their "victory" over Germany, the master class wish to be in possession of a "mandate" so that they can claim the allegiance of the armed forces should it be considered necessary to use these forces against the workers during troubles or disputes.

The plan succeeded. The people "who made the mess" were returned "to clear it up." They had, however, less trouble with the working class than some of them anticipated.

Weary of the war, and thankful for the relief of the Armistice, the workers accepted wage reductions and worse conditions with a minimum of protest. Wherever resistance was offered it was of a sectional, and often spasmodic, character, that the masters were able to defeat with

comparative ease. It was not so much lack of will or courage to resist, as ignorance of the fundamentals of their class position, that was responsible for the attitude adopted, for the majority could see no way out at present, and little hope in the future.

Freed to some extent from fear of trouble at home, the sections of the capitalist class among the Allies found more time to fight out their quarrels over the spoils of the "Great Victory." These quarrels reached a crisis in the Near East. Two sections of Imperialist financiers came to grips over the routes, areas and resources of the East. One section controlled the British Government, while the other section controlled the French Government. The situation, however, was somewhat awkward. Officially Britain and France were still Allies. It would be difficult openly to come to blows over the difference of interests in the booty, so each side put forward a "cat's paw" for the purpose of pulling the chestnuts out of the fire. The British Government put forward the Greeks, while the French Government supported the Turks.

It would be sheer folly to imagine that the British Government had any regard for the Greeks' "lawful aspirations" in Asia Minor, or the French Government any noble ideal of helping the Turks to their "freedom." Only those ignorant of the workings of the capitalist system could imagine such a thing. Whichever side may be acclaimed the winner, it will find that it can only move, organise and govern as its pay-

masters decide. At the moment of writing the Greeks have been driven out of Asia Minor, and the British section of Imperialist financiers have suffered a setback. Of course, the people concerned keep in the background. It is not they who will be blamed for the expense and trouble in the East. As a matter of fact, they always keep in the background, and allow their tools and puppets to take such praise or blame as may be coming in any given crisis. More, they are quite indifferent as to the fate of these puppets, once they have served the turn required.

The Imperialist financiers have always crowds of job-hunters waiting to take office as soon as any particular occupant is turned out. In the present case, almost all the mouthpieces of the capitalist class are united in putting the blame for the shaky situation in the East upon the shoulders of Lloyd George; but not one has whispered whose orders he obeyed when he made such "blunders."

In December, 1918, we described the position Lloyd George occupied in the following words:—

Behind this mountebank marionette stands the Imperialist section of the Capitalist class, composed of both Liberals and Tories, who are striving to extend their dominion and power of robbing the working class over larger areas of the globe. It was to protect their interests that this country entered into the war. When two years ago the military situation looked serious for the Allies, this section looked for a more pliant tool to take charge of the Government. One was at hand possessing a glib tongue, always ready with large and extravagant promises, quite unscrupulous, and able to sway crowds with his claptrap. A dirty political shuffle took place and Lloyd George became Prime Minister.

Of course, he wishes to retain the office. He wishes to pose as the head of the "Government that won the war," and wishes to be at its head when it "Reconstructs the Empire."

Not his wishes, however, but the interests of the Imperialists, whose agent he is, demanded this Election.

And, now, having failed to carry through their scheme successfully, Lloyd George is "sacked" with as little ceremony as an ordinary day labourer, by the Imperialist gang. He will be the "scapegoat" for the failure and will form a useful figure upon whom to put the blame, not only for the immediate trouble in the East, but also for the bad trade, unemployment, the chaotic exchanges—and the atmospheric storms

that hindered the astronomers from making full observations to test Einstein's theory!

The great advantage of such a "scapegoat," is that the attention of the mass of the workers will be diverted from studying the facts of the situation, into dwelling upon personalities. Yet even the sacrificing of a notorious tool can hardly conceal the emptiness of the alternatives offered.

The Liberals are far from anxious to take office, as is shown by the statement of the *Daily News* for October 20th, 1922:—

Whatever Government succeeded the Coalition could not but be an improvement, and in that one respect the events of yesterday are a matter for unreserved congratulation.

While further on in the same article we are told:—

There are obviously the gravest possible reasons against an immediate General Election.

It is easy to see from these paragraphs that the Liberals would prefer to let the Tories handle the muddle that exists.

The Tories seem clear on only one point: That public expenditure on any "unnecessary" legislation and administration must be reduced or abolished. Thus the *Daily Mail*, October 23rd, 1922, says:—

The country is anxiously waiting to hear from him [Mr. Bonar Law] what relief it may expect from the heavy loads which the late Government has laid upon it, and from the anxieties in which recent divagations of policy have placed our country.

The *Daily Express*, October 23rd, 1922, which claims to be independent and "bound to no party," declares that it:—

Intends to support that Conservative Party during the course of the General Election and to recommend the electors to return it to power.

Among the reasons given for this attitude we are told:—

Mr. Bonar Law can be trusted to pursue a safe and saving course at home as well as abroad. There would be an end of those ambitious schemes which cost millions, tax industry, depress credit and end in a financial fiasco.

To prevent confusion, however, the same article hastens to remark:—

In saying this the *Daily Express* shows no hostility to Liberalism.

And Mr. Bonar Law, himself, at the meeting of the Conservative Party that elected him leader, is reported as saying:—

What the country wanted was quiet and a reduction of our commitments, with little interference from legislation and administration.—*Evening Standard*, 23/10/22.

But Bonar Law is no less a tool than Lloyd George. The Imperialist gang will give him orders as to their requirements, and he must take those orders or go. Already some of those orders are beginning to be formulated in such a way that even the man in the street can see their trend.

Thus the *Observer*, October 22nd, 1922, under the heading "Russia Still the Acid Test," says:—

British policy ought to throw the whole weight of its influence into the scales in favour of full Russian participation. If we do that our policy will prosper. It will never look back in the sphere of foreign affairs either East or West.

Incidentally, the commercial cause of agreements, like the Urquhart Concession, would be promoted to the gain of employment. Otherwise, economic chances still open to ourselves would be transferred to foreign powers.

If the new Government did not resolve to settle fully with Russia, that issue would soon play its big part in sweeping them out. We desire to put that warning on record.

On the same page it is also stated that:—

Henceforth our only substantial security for any legitimate British interest connected with the Straits is friendship with Turkey and with other nations.

These points are supported by the *Daily Mail*, *Daily News*, *Daily Express*, *Evening Standard*, etc.

Here, then, the instructions are beyond doubt. Commercial relations with the East must be established, full and soon, to prevent British oil and shipping interests being beaten by the Americans and Japanese. A General Election will afford a good means of introducing this change of policy and of getting rid of a tool who has failed to carry out their orders as they wished.

So an Election is arranged for November 15th. The Tories put forward the programme referred to above. The Liberal Party make numerous promises as usual, and vaguely refer to "Liberal Principles" without running the risk of defining them. The Labour Party promise to show the people how to save money by spending it, for in their official programme they say:—

Labour attaches the utmost importance to economy in the public administration. But we do not believe in starving the public services.—*Daily Herald*, 26/10/22.

Especially those that have provided so many jobs for Labour Leaders. Another staggeringly original statement is:—

Unemployment and low wages, caused largely

by the policy of the Liberal and Unionist Government, have brought distress to the bulk of the working people.—*Ibid*.

Had such "unemployment and low wages" been caused by the policy of a Labour Party, are we to assume there would have been no "distress?" One of their remedies for unemployment is "the national organisation of production," but they attach "the utmost importance to economy in the public administration." National organisation of industry should certainly be more economical—that is carried on by fewer workers per unit of service—than organisation by private individuals. So the remedy for unemployment is to reduce the number at work by "national organisation!" Seems to be a catch somewhere?

All of them, however, are united in condemning Lloyd George. In this they are assisted by the Communist Party, who, with their usual blindness to facts and their ignorance of the real forces moving in Society, follow the capitalist press in placing responsibility upon Lloyd George. In the *Communist* (September 30th, 1922), is a certain cartoon on the front page wherein the workers are advised to "Dump Him," and on the centre page we are told "David must sweat for this." In their issue of October 14th, 1922, a displayed paragraph warns us to "Watch Lloyd George," and we are told:—

His one hope of saving his position, his place, and his emoluments is a war.

Five days later this terrible, powerful person, who could "make war," is tumbled out of his job neck and crop.

To-day, Lloyd George is trying to gather around him the remnants of his scattered crew to form a "Party" that, unhampered by any fixed principles or programme, will hold itself free to support or oppose any Government or Cabinet, till it can once more, it hopes, secure recognition from the chiefs of the capitalist class. One of his most rabid supporters—J. I. Garvin—promises him this recognition, with greater power than ever, if he will only wait a few years. But a flare fire wants continual replenishing, and a very few years would see the slimy Welshman snuffed out of political life.

Whichever Party contesting this Election

obtains a majority, it will leave the workers in their present state. The unemployment, want, hardship, and insecurity of existence that afflict the workers in all capitalist countries, will not be abolished either by war with Turkey or peace with Russia; by changing Lloyd George for Bonar Law or A. Henderson; by voting for Tory candidates instead of Coalition ones; or for Labour candidates instead of either.

Because these things are not the CAUSE of the workers' misery. That cause is the private ownership of the means of life. Under capitalism the master class owns the raw materials, the means of transport, the machinery and factories requisite for wealth production. As a result they own the wealth that is produced. Hence the workers are a propertyless class, and can only live by permission of the capitalists. To put it shortly, they are SLAVES to the owning class.

This is the crucial test. Liberal, Tory, Coalition, or Labour Parties all stand for the retention of capitalism—therefore, for the continuance of the slavery of the workers. With the developments in machinery and the increasing applications of science to industry, with the elimination of competition by the further formation of Trusts and Combines, the effective demands of the world's markets are met with a constantly decreasing number of workers employed to produce a given amount of wealth. Hence, apart from temporary fluctuations, unemployment is bound to increase.

Peace in the East, business with Russia, cannot result in more than a temporary fillip to trade compared with the world's production. Reduction of taxation is of no concern at all to the workers. The only solution to their troubles is the abolition of the cause—the private ownership of the means of life. Until they decide to carry this abolition through, their position as a whole is bound to grow worse by the operation of the factors given above.

To abolish their slavery; to establish the common ownership and control of the means of wealth production and distribution, the workers must first seize the governing machinery of society. This is the political machinery, with its centre in Parliament.

At any General Election the workers can do this, because they have the vast majority

of the votes. But behind the vote is needed knowledge. Only when the majority of the workers understand they are slaves will they be in the position to end their subjection. Until then they will remain slaves.

In this election how few are the workers who understand their class position is shown by the fact that not a single Socialist candidate will be seeking election.

This will not prevent those desiring Socialism from voting for it. They can go to the polls, write Socialism across the ballot paper, and thus add their quota to the factors making for working class enlightenment.

When a sufficient number are enlightened then we shall see the workers organise into the Socialist Party, putting forward their delegates and voting them into Parliament. With this control they will be able to enter into possession of the means of life, and end not only wars, Eastern or Western, but abolish the misery and hardship of the present system, and replace by the system that will secure comfort and happiness to all—namely, SOCIALISM.

Executive Committee,
Socialist Party of Great Britain,
October, 1922.

AN INVITATION

will be given to Subscribers to the £1000 Fund
(minimum subscription, 1/-) to a

SELECT DANCE

TO BE HELD AT

THE TOWN HALL,
MARE STREET, HACKNEY,

On Saturday, December 30th, 1922.

Doors open 7 o'clock Dancing 7.30 p.m.

Further particulars can be obtained from the SECRETARY, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1, or from any of the local branches (for addresses see back page), who will also be open to receive subscriptions.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra.
To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

JOTTINGS.

We hear doleful tales of the ruin coming when workers protest against wage cuts. The "poverty" of our masters in these times of trouble is gloomily dilated upon. "Somebody," however, is not doing badly, as witness the following quotation from the *Daily News* (18/10/22):—

300 PER CENT. DIVIDEND.
PLAN FOR FIVE-FOLD INCREASE IN
VACUUM OIL STOCK.

New York, Tuesday.

The directors of the Vacuum Oil Company, one of the Standard Oil group, have voted to increase the company's stock from 15,000,000 dollars to 75,000,000 dollars.

The shareholders will be asked at a meeting on December 2nd to approve the plan.

The proposal is the result of the declaration of a dividend of 300 per cent.—*Reuter*.

300 per cent. ! That means to say that the shareholders have received their money back three times over, and still have the original amount invested in the company. Oil is booming !

In their issue for May 31st, 1921, the *Daily News* published an article entitled "World Rivalry for Oil," by their New York correspondent. Some of the figures in that article are somewhat startling. For example, he states:—

In 1914-15 the profits of the Mexican Eagle Oil Company were 5,900,000 dollars. In 1919-20 they had risen to 59,000,000 dollars, an increase of 1,000 per cent. In 1914 the Burmah Oil Company had a profit of £971,278. Five years later that profit was £2,849,000.

In eight years the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey increased its earnings from 35 millions dollars to 101 millions, and in 1918 paid 44 millions in income tax.

Such are the people who complain that "industry" will not bear the burden of present wages !

While the unemployed are demanding work, the scientists, at the behest of the capitalists, are pursuing exhaustive enquiries and experiments to reduce work as much as possible. To put the point another way, the application of science to industry is being speeded up with a view to increasing the amount of wealth a worker can produce without using up more energy. We have frequently given evidence in these columns of the increasing use of machinery; the providing of better surroundings—such as those existing at Port Sunlight and

similar places; the increase in volume and simplification of effort by means of mass production; the reduction in the number of operations an individual worker performs; the introduction in certain factories of frequent rest periods; and the introduction of music into others; and hosts of other things.

The latest idea, however, is set forth in the *Daily News* (18/10/22) in an article dealing with the experiments being carried on by the Department of Applied Physiology at the Medical Research Institute, Hampstead. From this article we learn that:—

Part of the work of this Research Institute consists of measuring the amount of effort which a man expends under certain conditions of labour.

The article then goes on to describe an experiment that took place. A man got on to a stationary bicycle wearing a mask with two valves. He cycled for five minutes, and the result of his effort is estimated accurately by delicately balanced instruments attached to the bicycle, and also certain apparatus attached to the mask.

The article then goes on as follows:—

By these measurements we can find out," said Professor Hill, "how much fuel has been burnt by the human furnace, and how much energy has been expended during those five minutes' work."

The Department has converted a disused corridor into a wind tunnel. A bracing wind is generated by a huge fan at one end of the tunnel, and in this breezy atmosphere the spell of work on the bicycle-ergometer is repeated.

It is found that in these conditions the work is performed with far greater ease and freedom from fatigue than in the air of an ordinary room.

With the use of a little imagination, we can picture the wage worker of the future turning up at the factory gate—to be "weighed in," his energy measured, put into room with a whirlwind, and tearing through the work like a tornado! Not much chance of "dodging the foreman" then! His capacity and his performance will be measured with delicate instruments!

The point in the business is that, whereas the capitalists of all countries try to convince us that unemployment is due to falling markets, they are all employing the methods that must of necessity increase the relative volume of the wealth produced, and at the same time choke the markets. Thus the forces of capitalism inevitably tend to increase unemployment.

Lloyd George defined his political outlook in a speech he made at the opening of the new offices of the Port of London Authority on Tower Hill. The treasure is worth preserving. He said:—

I am very pleased to see something which represents the spirit of compromise characteristic of our people—something which represents no principle of any sort or kind, but is an outrage on every principle you can lay down. And yet it works.—*Daily News*, 18/10/22.

Such is the outlook of the man who has proved himself to be, in many ways, an admirable tool to carry out the wishes of the master class. Ambitious, unscrupulous and deceitful, he has a glib tongue that could sway crowds, and flattery and cajolery that could turn the heads of "Labour leaders" and hoodwink workers' deputations. He steered the helm of State successfully for a time on behalf of those whose interests he served. Why did his "lack of principle" work? Because at the back of compromise, and apparent lack of principle there was, after all, a principle that governed his actions. That principle was the advancement of the interests of the capitalist class.

* * *

The *Communist* for 21st October, 1922, contains the election policy of the Communist Party for the Local Government Elections. An examination of this document reveals the value of this wild and woolly gang of compromisers.

The final solution of the workers' troubles, they contend, can only be arrived at by "the workers taking over control of the affairs of the community through their own machinery of government—the Soviets". But in the meantime (blessed word!) there are many points on which there is agreement and on which all could combine; and it considers it "its duty to the working class . . . to join in with the rest in making the attempt to see what can be done with the existing forms of local government." This is very interesting—and so like the conciliatory spirit pervading the recent religious conferences on unity!

Now let us examine some of the matters upon which there can be general agreement.

These are some items from the programme:—

2.—The absorption of the excess workers in each locality, as far as possible, by the extension of useful public enterprise.

What is "useful public enterprise?" Obviously doing work that, in general, would otherwise be done by private enterprise. In other words, throwing out of work the workers in one direction to employ less of them in another—because, as a rule, the work of a public body takes the place of the work of several private bodies, eliminating overlapping and waste. Overlapping and waste usually mean more work for workers. What a truly brilliant method of absorbing excess workers? In any case why "useful public enterprise?" What does it matter to the starving unemployed whether the work is useful or useless, so long as it enables them to get bread? Digging holes and filling them up again will cost the capitalist some of his wealth, but will not hurt the workers. The Communist Party is evidently concerned about assisting the capitalist to "save the rates." This is borne out by the following:—

20.—Pooling of rates in all populous centres to avoid distinction between rich and poor areas.

The Communist Party is concerned about the rates—a matter which we have frequently demonstrated affects the capitalist class alone.

Item 3 demands nationalisation of land—that old bogey and well-worn labour shibboleth. It is an excellent means of increasing unemployment and assisting the capitalists. The Communists are really very much concerned about the interests of the capitalists.

There are many other fat-headed items in the programme, but I had better finish up, or the Editorial Committee will be hitting me over the head for using up too many of the valuable columns in this paper.

PUNCHINELLO.

AN ECONOMIC CLASS

is being held by

BATTERSEA BRANCH, S.P.G.B.

at

16, Creek Street, York Road, Battersea,

EVERY MONDAY EVENING, at 7.30 p.m.

THE NUT.

If there is one thing more than another which Socialists resent, it is the master's contempt of working-class intelligence. Think of the recruiting posters of six and seven years ago, of the kind of nursing the constituencies get prior to a general election. Look at the public speeches of Mr. Lloyd George, with their inevitable and ludicrous metaphor. A picturesque figure catches the workers' fancy; they take up a pat phrase like the latest comic song, and he knows it. The capitalists and their apologists have taken the measure of proletarian simplicity, and the workers generally prove their calculations' right.

But to see what downright insolence our class will tolerate it is necessary to go with them to the theatre or cinema, and see some of the things they applaud. A recent popular Douglas Fairbank's film is a gem of this kind. The heroine of "The Nut," a girl of the upper class, has a bright plan for bringing the millennium. "If everybody with a refined home," she declares, "would open their doors for an hour each day to a child or two from the slum districts, the influence of these surroundings would be so great that the children would be bound to grow up better citizens in every way." This hour, she is sure, will so colour the child's growing mind that it will as naturally seek the good and beautiful as a growing flower seeks the sun.

Can you beat that?

A regular contributor to the *Star*, G.F.M., had a few words to say about it when the film was first shown, thought it a most beautiful idea in the abstract, and practicable, possibly, in America, where the poor have a "different attitude" towards the rich, but foresaw a little difficulty, somehow, in working it in London. She couldn't see herself going to a woman's door in Bethnal Green, and explaining "how much more refined my home was than hers, and how greatly her children would benefit by a daily visit."

On the whole, we think G.F.M.'s instinct was sound. The idea being, presented not on the screen, but on her own doorstep, the woman worker would almost certainly say many things not printable in the *Socialist Standard*. Let us hope she would go further, and having heard and thought upon

the message of our speakers in the open places and at street corners, would add, "You can boast of a refined home because we and millions like us spend our days in toil. You can point to our squalor because you and a few thousand like you steal what our toil brings forth. You want our children to have high aspirations. They shall; we will attend to that ourselves. For we are learning at last that the power is ours to despoil you, and make the world our own."

A.

The wealth of the soil, the harvests, the fruits, the splendid cattle that grow sleek and fat in the luxuriant grass, are the property of the few, and but instruments of the many. The man of leisure seldom loves, for their own sake, the fields and meadows, the landscape, or the noble animals which are to be converted into gold for his use. He comes to the country for his health, or for change of air, but goes back to town to spend the fruit of his vassal's labour.

On the other hand, the peasant is too abject, too wretched, and too fearful of the future to enjoy the beauty of the country and the charms of pastoral life. To him, also, the yellow harvest fields, the rich meadows, the fine cattle, represent bags of gold; but he knows that only an infinitesimal part of their contents, insufficient for his daily needs, will ever fall to his share. Yet year by year he must fill those accursed bags, to please his master, and buy the right of living on his land in sordid wretchedness.

GEORGE SAND.

A Lecture on THE COMING OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION

will be delivered at

THE TOWN HALL, POPLAR

Newby Place,

ON

Sunday, 19th November, 1922

at 7.30 p.m.

Admission Free.

Questions & Discussion

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... 3s. 0d.
Six Months, post free... 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

NOVEMBER



1922

BEHIND THE FALL OF THE COALITION.

The bulk of the world's oil supply comes from America. According to the *Daily News* (May 31st, 1921), "82 per cent. of oil comes either from the United States or from American mines in Mexico." The same paper states that within 15 years the wells of the United States, unless conserved, will give out. The Standard Oil Co. practically controls the American supply and, consequently, they have been looking abroad lately for fresh fields. In this they have come into conflict with the Dutch and British group of oil companies. The capital of the respective oil companies is tremendous, and they use their resources to shape the policies of the different world powers.

The fight for oilfields and control of oil distribution has played a large part in recent foreign policy. Behind the Russian negotiations and the Mesopotamian squabble lurked the power of oil.

On Thursday, October 26th, 1922, the *Financial Times* reports an interview with Mr. J. Koster, the managing director of several oil enterprises. Mr. Koster, after giving detailed evidence to prove that America would be facing a shortage of oil in the near future, wound up as follows:—

My study of the world's oil position teaches

me these significant facts. The conclusion I have arrived at is that in the United States within the next two years there will be a crude oil shortage, and the prices of crude oil and oil-products, and the value of yet unmined petroleum, must necessarily feel the effects of such unavoidable shortage, and the one result can only be higher prices and a large premium for oil reserves.

So the British and Dutch oil enterprises that have succeeded in securing control of a large part of the world's petroleum reserves can face the future with every confidence. In order to account for this, one has but to consider the effect which a stopping of all export from the United States, combined with a decreasing export from Mexico, would have on the markets outside of America. Besides the profits already obtained under the present circumstances by undertakings working in countries like the Argentine Republic, Venezuela, Persia, the Far East and Roumania, the future of such undertakings, thanks to the state of affairs in the United States, seems to offer almost unlimited possibilities.

The prize is large, the future bright—what seeds for future turmoils! The Anglo-Persian (in which the British Government has a large interest) and Shell Groups have angled themselves into a good position in the East to threaten the position of the Standard Oil Co., and the fight between these groups to corner the world's supply is now going ahead fast and furious.

Another factor at the root of the late Government's fall has been suggested by two recent happenings.

Mr. Leslie Urquhart, the Chairman of the Russo-Asiatic Corporation, negotiated an agreement with a representative of the Russian Government under which his corporation gained certain concessions in Russia. Arising out of the British Government's muddling of the recent near Eastern problems, the Russian Government refused to endorse the Urquhart concession. In his speech to the shareholders of the Russo-Asiatic Corporation on October 23rd, 1922 (see *Evening Standard* for that date), Urquhart blames the British Government's policy for his failure, and urges that Russia should be treated as any other world power. He also deprecates the suggestion that his corporation would endeavour in any way to influence Government policy. The next day Mr. McKenna, the Chairman of the London Joint City & Midland Bank, and formerly a Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer, threw overboard his former associates, and appeared on a Tory platform, advising his audience of business men

to support Bonar Law, the new Tory Prime Minister. On the surface, this might appear as an ordinary case of a political turn-coat. It is a curious fact, however, that the London Joint City & Midland Bank owns thousands of shares in the Russo-Asiatic Corporation. Would it be too bold to suggest, in spite of Mr. Urquhart, that the above corporation have succeeded in influencing Government policy?

THE MAN IN THE STREET.

The enemy is once again pulling the leg of the worker by raising the old gag of the "Burden of taxation on the man in the street." This poor fellow, judging from an editorial in the *Daily News* (10/5/22), appears to be an infant requiring the guidance of a nursemaid, whom we can all recognise under the name of Miss Print. Through the strenuous efforts of this ubiquitous creature the Man-in-the-Street, infant that he is, is cajoled, frightened, or badgered by various bogeys which are trotted out to distract his attention lest he gain knowledge which will threaten the career of his callous nurse and those who pay her.

One of the chief bogey stunts is the Taxation Bogey, which Miss Print and politicians have used with great effect, and advantage to themselves.

The infant is led to believe by the *Daily News* scribe that the expenditure on the Admiralty Department comes out of his pocket, and that "the Admiralty has been able, by simple defiance, to reduce the 'cuts' demanded of it from 21 millions to 4 millions."

He is told "not Parliament, nor the Government, but the Departments determine now what taxes you are to pay."

In thrusting this bogey before the eyes of the Infant-in-the-Street, the *Daily Nurse* is ably seconded by Labour and unemployed leaders of all descriptions, each intent on fooling the infant into the belief that there is nothing else so important to him as the question of taxation.

Within the capitalist class there is a difference of opinion as to the amount to be expended on the upkeep of the Army, Navy, and other Departmental Services.

The section the *Daily News* speaks for have not in general an urgent need for

armaments on an Imperialistic scale, other than those required for keeping intact the system of private property and the right of exploitation at home. Their outlook is National Defence against the working class, and they profess to trust to peaceful penetration for development of foreign trade; and possibly they consider themselves clearer sighted than those sections who do not judge the situation otherwise than through the spectacles of expansion of trade and exploitation of markets by conquest or a display of force.

However, the economy stunts, whether these take the shape of cutting down Government staffs of clerks and mechanics, the lowering of wages, or fewer orders to armament firms, do not improve the position of the worker whom the *Daily News* refers to as the Man-in-the-Street.

To suggest to such a man when he is thrown on the unemployed heap that he has been sacked so that he will not have to pay so much in taxes, is sheer humbug. When a man is employed he sells daily, weekly, or monthly his physical and mental energy at a price which on the average is merely sufficient to reproduce that labour force which, when applied to natural materials, produces wealth, and in the sphere of organisation and distribution carries out the functions which the system of capitalism requires.

You unemployed! You who are in very truth the Men on the Street. You believe that you pay taxes. Well, if you do not pay them when you are employed, how can you pay them when unemployed?

To return to the editorial:—

Once again not the real necessities of national defence, but what each Department thinks to be necessary for the efficiency of its own service, quite regardless of whether it is or is not being duplicated by others, determines the rate of taxation which you pay.

Well, what if there is duplication? It is not the workers' funeral; there are one and a half million unemployed who would be very pleased if there was more duplication, and, either way, duplicated jobs or no jobs, the rate of taxation need not be any cause of worry to them.

The Man-in-the-Street has yet to realise that within the capitalist ranks there are struggles between sections to gain control of the political machinery, in order, among other things, that the burden of taxation

may be made as light as possible for the section in control, and thus we find sectional differences of opinion as to the requirements of the various State Departments.

Each section contends its policy is the best, and appeals to the workers on the grounds of economy and progress.

In reference to the matter of education, we see the antagonism between two sections showing clearly, for according to the *Daily News* scribe, Sir Eric Geddes asserts:—

That it is the work of a visionary with only one eye to educate children for higher positions and advancement in industry when in the very doing of it he is going to kill the industry and the commerce to which these children will have to look for a livelihood.

Replying to the above, the *Daily News* writer says:—

The answer to that is that the ultimate threat to British industry in competition with American and German is much more likely to be lack of trained brains than lack of capital or credit. It is a misfortune to be one-eyed, but it is a worse misfortune to be blind.

Here there are two points of view clearly defined, the *Daily News* admitting that it is not likely there will be any lack of capital or credit, is anxious to carry on in what may be termed the peaceful competitive style; apparently forgetting that the more intense the technical and commercial education, the keener will be the competition not only between workers for jobs (this is probably what the writer had in his mind's eye), but also between national groups of capitalists for the world's markets, thus inevitably leading to a war more merciless even than the last.

The other view-point, that of Sir Eric Geddes quoted by the *Daily News* is, that taxes for education will ruin industry, and he obviously believes that there are a sufficient number of educated wage slaves for the efficient development of industry and trade, and that force is the best method for controlling and gaining markets. Expressed in other terms, this means that naval and army expenditure for the protection of capital and the acquisition of exploitable territories is justified.

Although the struggles for positions amongst the workers who have been educated at Secondary and Technical Schools has reached even now a terrible

pitch, the *Daily News* is prepared to tell the Man-in-the-Street that technical education is a good thing for him and leads surely to good positions in industry.

Thus the minds of many in the working class are impressed with the need for advanced education; and many parents, both in the professional and manual grades of the working class, turn their attention (forced, indeed, by the very pressure of the circumstances of capitalism, though few would explain it in such terms) to the schools of engineering, commerce and commercial "art," in the hope that in one or the other spheres of industry their children may find safe anchorage and a comfortable income.

It is probable then that taxation for education is likely to be more popular than taxation for the upkeep of armaments, for says the one side: Does not education stand for progress? Are not armaments a monument to waste?

The Socialist message to the Man-in-the-Street is that they are two phases of one thing—the system of capitalism. Capitalist progress means high productivity, profits, economy of labour to the capitalist, but ill-health and nervous tension, robbery of, and unemployment, to the worker.

He has nothing to gain by supporting taxation or anti-taxation stunts from which ever side of capitalism they come, for in any case taxes have to be raised for the upkeep of the various Departments, and they can only be paid from the accumulated wealth which has been wrung from the workers who are the victims of a system of robbery which day by day extracts surplus value from them. It is a misfortune to be blind, but the Man-in-the-Street is not aware of his affliction; nevertheless, the numbers are steadily increasing of those who have seen the light and refuse to be led up the "garden" by Miss Print, and there will be soon a vast army working consciously towards the Socialist goal—Socialism.

E. J.

Is not the furrow of the labourer of as much value as that of the idler, even if that idler, by some absurd chance, has made a little noise in the world, and left behind him an abiding name?

GEORGE SAND.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Dear Editor,—

I read with great interest your article entitled "The Collapse of Capitalism."

There seems a great difference between "Capitalism in Collapse" and "Capitalism in imminent Collapse." As the Communist Party of Russia has pointed out—the collapse may be extended over a period of years; Lenin says ten years.

The final stage of collapse will not be caused by production of commodities ceasing, but by the lack of world markets. In fact, production will be on such a large scale internationally that the distribution of the products will cease owing to the small incomes and unemployment of the wage slaves, and lack of markets. The collapse of Capitalism in Europe would bring down Capitalism in the West owing to the internationalism of our modern economic and political systems. Former great wars, such as the Napoleonic wars, form a very bad analogy, as in that war the instruments of production were not nearly so great as today, and there were new and coming markets, and less countries so productive as today.

Again, your question of Russia seems remarkable, coming from the "S. S." Russia is relying on Capitalism to a certain extent, because, as the "S. S." has often pointed out, Russia before the Revolution was not a developed Capitalist Empire. Its wage slaves were not "educated" to mind machines and produce wealth, as the wage slaves of U.S.A., Germany and England. From 1914–1920, wars crushed Russia. There is no need for me to repeat the terrible story to the readers of the "S. S." Then came the drought. Yes, Comrades, Capitalism is in collapse, but like a candle which is near burning itself out; it flickers and flickers for a very long time, every moment it is expected to "go out," and yet lingers on. But a time comes when it does die. How like Capitalism it is in collapse—it may last even for ten years, but what is ten years in the history of the world?

Of course, Socialists cannot afford to wait for the system to collapse! As we look at the struggle between Capitalism and International Socialism, we become keener on convincing the worker of the need for the

common ownership and control of the instruments of production and the need to organise politically by the vote to take power, and industrially to take economic control. Nor can we afford to remain outside the struggle like the S.P.C.B., merely content to write fine articles.

Every struggle of the workers must be ours, and we must stand by them, even in the smallest of battles.

Yours faithfully,
"S. W."

OUR REPLY.

First our correspondent points to the difference between "collapse" and "imminent collapse." There is a difference, but it is one of date only, and not, as he suggests, one of form. A process of disintegration spread over a period of years cannot, in my opinion, accurately be described as a collapse. In any event, Palme Dutt did not appear to mean this process, and it would seem, therefore, that Mr. Warr does not hold his view.

Palme Dutt's view is, I think, very well expressed by the following extract from Herman Cahn's "Collapse of Capitalism": "A new force has grown up which no longer leaves the downfall of capitalism to the vague future, or its earlier ending to the spread of a high intelligence among the real proletariat, but makes the coming of that great event a matter of figures, and entirely independent of even the collective will of men. The war has enormously hastened the development of this force, and the catastrophe is imminent." (Page 8.)

In writing "the final stage of collapse will not be caused by production of commodities ceasing, but by the lack of world markets," I gather that Mr. Warr intends to rule out the possibility of a physical collapse, but he does not show how the lack of markets is going to do what he assumes it will.

The restriction of markets is one of the series of difficulties which have arisen out of the contradictions of the system. The endeavour on the part of the capitalists to reconcile these contradictions has always been in evidence in some degree since the rise of capitalist society.

Mr. Warr, however, does not consider that there is an analogy between the present depression and that following the

Napoleonic wars, because "the instruments of production were not nearly so great as to-day." He overlooks the important point that the only useful comparison is between the powers of production *then* and the effective demand *then*. Relative to this country's powers of production, there was an acute shrinkage of markets. In the February issue was an extract from the writings of Robert Owen, which dealt with this crisis. He wrote for instance:—"this very superabundance of wealth was the sole cause of existing distress."

It is true the problems which arise become more numerous, and difficult to meet, and are for the capitalists insoluble: but it must be remembered that they are under no obligation to solve them.

The suffering falls on the workers, and while the workers are content to leave the ruling class in control, the suffering will remain. Only such minor adaptations are required and will be forthcoming as will allay any acute working class unrest. So long as the workers accept doles there is no unemployment problem which the capitalists are called upon to solve.

Even if the position gets much worse the choice before the workers is still the same; either to accept their condition, or rejecting it, to endeavour to remove the cause by overthrowing the system. To be effective they must, as Mr. Warr says, organise to "take power," but I fail to see that he has shown either that the problem is different from what it was 10 or 20 years ago, or that there is any method other than that advocated by the Socialist Party.

If Mr. Warr really believed that the "lack of world markets" would bring Socialism, he would not trouble about "convincing the workers."

The Bolsheviks are depending on Capitalist enterprise because collapse or no collapse, there is no prospect of revolution in Western Europe. There will be no revolution because there are too few revolutionaries.

If by "struggle" Mr. Warr means strikes, etc., it is news to me that emancipation would be hastened by our telling the workers that all would be well if only they refuse to work overtime, or insist on their right to wear a union badge in the employer's factory. I am not aware that membership of this party makes a worker

fight any the less vigorously in the day-to-day struggle, and finally as Socialist knowledge is necessary for emancipation, I have yet to be convinced that there is anything the Socialist Party can engage in more useful than propagating Socialism.

H.

Dear Editor,

The relative merits of the Socialist Labour Party and Socialist Party of Great Britain have been discussed for weeks by a few Marxian students without coming to any satisfactory conclusion as to which party propounds the correct principles that deserve working class support.

Under these circumstances it was thought wise to present some of the views expressed by the supporters of the S.L.P., so that your party may oblige with an answer in an early issue of your *Standard*. They say that your party is very inconsistent, as proven by the back numbers of the *Socialist Standard* and Manifesto. On page 17 of the latter, to top of page 18, we find as follows:—

"The workers' organisation, political and economic, must be upon the basis of their class, with the object of ending the capitalist system and establishing the Socialist Commonwealth."

The inconsistency is obvious, they say, when one sees in that statement that your party recognises the necessity of an economic organisation, based upon class; and at the same time in actual practice only believe in a political organisation.

The proof of this is seen when one reads clause 6 of your party's "Declaration of Principles."

The irony of the situation, say they, lies in the fact that your party should see the necessity of the economic organisation, and then publish matter in your *Socialist Standard* to absolutely ridicule the said type of organisation. For instance, in the February, 1919, *Standard*, under the title, "Where we Stand," on the bottom of page 54, is a brief statement as follows: "How long it does take some people to discover the absurdity of their sophistries! We pointed out the idiocy of organisation by industries years ago." Then, again, is that statement in agreement with the brief statement at the end of article called "What the Workers Do Understand," in January,

1921, *Standard*, which read as follows:—"Educated in these things, and organised on the industrial and political fields, they will seize political power and wield it, and its forces, for the paramount purpose—the establishment of the Socialist Commonwealth." Why mention "organised industrially," if it is an idiotic act?

These super-intellects say that you are all "at sea" on another point of importance. You state in your Manifesto, page 18, as follows: "Emancipation, not palliation, must be the watchword of the workers, as it will be when they become Socialists." Lower down on the same page is as follows: "Its tactics must be aggressive as well as defensive, and its aim revolutionary."

Do the two statements clash? Are not the tactics of aggression on the side of palliation? Have not the workers through their industrial unions been aggressive, which aggression has only palliated their conditions? Apart from that, it is highly questionable whether (even if the Trade Unions did adopt the Socialist attitude, as you state) they could, and successfully, adopt an aggressive and defensive attitude.

Your party seems to think that it is a wise tactic to be always ready to defend working class interests, irrespective whether conditions are suitable or not, as is shown in the article "The Betrayal of the Miners" (in the *Standard*, May 21st, page 138, half-way down second column), which reads as follows: "Had the rank and file of the Triple Alliance understood even their ordinary Trade Union interests, they would have stood together and fought to the fullest extent of their power against this attempt to worsen their conditions." Obviously, your party thought that had the Triple Alliance acted and taken that defensive attitude against the interests of the employers, all would have been well. This means a sectional strike (which your party ridicules). We may ask: what hope of success was there had it taken place, under the conditions then existing? This would have been putting the so-called economic power of Triple Alliance against the political power of the masters. Obviously, had it turned out to be a fight between the two powers, the former power would have been beaten by the latter power, by the ordering, if necessary, of the police and soldiers to act against the workers. Again, such a

strike would prevent the normal distribution of the food supply, which is necessary for the workers; and under such circumstances the shortage of food would be sufficient to force the workers back to the workshop. These very same factors of a political nature would also work against the workers' organisations, should they adopt a palliative or an aggressive attitude.

So, in conclusion, the persons interested in this controversy would be highly pleased if you would endeavour to give your reply to the same in the November *Standard*.

I remain, yours for Socialism,
EDWARD LITTLER.

ANSWER TO E. LITTLER.

For convenience of reference, we have numbered the paragraphs in above letter that call for specific answers.

No. 1.—The Declaration of Principles lays down the *minimum* essential factors of the Socialist position. For instance, that Declaration says nothing about carrying on the propaganda for Socialism—yet the S.P.G.B. does it.

Conceivably, Socialism could be established by the political organisation alone, but the economic organisation alone would be quite powerless to establish it. In actual fact, as the conditions allow, both organisations will be used by Socialists for the attainment of their object, though the seizure of power, the greatest by far of the factors at our disposal, will be carried through by the political organisation. Thus no inconsistency in the position of the S.P.G.B. is shown in our correspondent's statement.

No. 2.—On this point the questioners are so blind that they cannot see that their query is already answered in the quotation they themselves give from our Manifesto, which says:—

"The workers' organisation, political and economic, must be upon the basis of their class."

The organisations we have ridiculed have never been based upon the class position of the workers, but have been those supported by the S.L.P., which consisted in the mass of supporters of capitalism, and which the S.L.P. claimed could "take and hold" the means of production against the armed forces under the control of the masters.

As we have pointed out on various occasions, economic development has travelled beyond the limits of "industry" in numerous directions, and, therefore, the workers' organisations must cover a wider area than the "industry" even to "keep pace." The quotation from the *Socialist Standard* of January, 1921, is of no help to the S.L.P., as the word "industrial" is used here to denote the whole economic field. This is clearly shown by the context.

No. 3.—No! The two statements do not clash, as even a superficial reading would show. To emancipate itself, the working class must become revolutionary, because it must carry through a revolution before emancipation can take place.

The workers have been no more "aggressive" in the so-called "industrial" unions than in the ordinary "craft" unions, though the failure of such "aggression" would be a blow at the S.L.P., which supports these unions—not at us

No. 4.—While we are always ready to defend working class interests, the phrase "whether conditions are suitable or not" needs explaining. The reference to the article on "The Miners' Betrayal" is beside the point. The miners were being attacked, and the railwaymen and transport workers were being threatened with an attack. In such conditions, the business of the men concerned, obviously, was to fight together—as the article says—to the extent of their powers. There was no question here of pitting the economic organisation of the Triple Alliance against the armed forces. This ghastly policy, propounded and defended by the Industrial Unionists and the S.L.P., is one we have denounced on scores of occasions. Under some conditions even a sectional strike is better than no struggle at all, and the members of the Triple Alliance would have prevented some of the conditions being imposed upon them that they now suffer under, had they struck on "Black Friday." How far the interference with the normal food supply would affect the struggle is mere guesswork. Partly it would have depended on the length of the strike. Every strike of any size causes inconvenience and sometimes suffering. But to follow the above argument to its logical conclusion means that the workers must accept anything the masters choose to impose, even though it may mean

greater suffering than would be entailed by a strike!

On the economic field the workers' powers are limited, and in the ultimate, can always be beaten by the possessors of political power. But, as Marx has pointed out, these everyday struggles, with all their limitations, are a product of the system, and cannot be avoided unless the workers are ready to sink below "cooliedom."

A little further information on the position of the S.L.P. may perhaps be interesting.

In the *Socialist*, 15/4/1920, they state in the editorial, with reference to the actions of certain prominent members who had broken away from the organisation:—

The whole trouble is that a self-condemned Unity Committee, who had more or less "bossed" the Party for the last four years, found themselves up against the rank and file of the S.L.P. in their efforts to compromise Revolutionary Socialism.

That is a peculiar admission for a self-styled Working Class Party! If the party is so constituted that one group could boss it for four years, what is to prevent other groups successively bossing it *ad infinitum*?

Further on in the same editorial they write:—

Send in your resolutions to your Executive. Indicate your wishes, strengthen your Executive's hands in the good work it has carried on since it took up office in September, 1919, when it placed the control of the Party and its Press in the hands of the rank and file.

According to the above, the control of the party and its Press was not in the hands of the rank and file until September, 1919. A startling admission this, after an existence of 15 years!

After the revolutionary action of placing the party in the hands of the rank and file, an article appeared in the *Socialist* on the miners' strike. The following are some extracts from it:—

THE MINERS SHOULD NOT STRIKE.

My advice to the miners is, don't strike. Why should you? "Take and hold" should be your slogan. You have a splendid opportunity at this juncture. Work the mines for yourselves.

MINERS, SEIZE THE MINES.

Is it possible—It is."

Then follows instructions to the miners to issue a statement saying that on and from a certain date the mines will be worked by the Miners' Federation of Great Britain. Coal to be reduced by 14s. 2d. per ton, and

miners' wages increased 2s. per day. So easy! How simple these people are! And what would the masters be doing while this little transaction was taking place? The same as they do in a strike: bring the armed force to bear on the situation. But the S.L.P. have provided for this:—

The Army will support you. Call for the support of the Army.

Let your call be "All Power to the Workers." If you do this you will win hands down.

Simple, isn't it? What wonderful childish nonsense! Anyhow, the subsequent action of the Army and Volunteer Force, when a railway strike was expected, should have knocked that idiocy out of their heads.

It would be interesting to find out what the S.L.P. mean when they state in their Platform:—

Whilst the working-class are compelled to organise to capture the means of production, distribution, and exchange to be worked in the interests of society as a whole.

Money is the means of exchange. They then are working for a system under which money will exist. An elementary knowledge of money would tell them that it can only exist where buying and selling exists. In other words, where private property exists. According to their platform, then, they are not out for Socialism.

In spite of all the noise they make about industrial action, they themselves are not clear as to what their own position is. Since the inception of the S.L.P. the columns of the *Socialist* have been largely occupied with the disagreements of members as to the position on industrial unionism. From last January onwards a discussion raged, under the title of "The Problem of Policy." Finally, at their Easter Conference, they decided to support the "Workers' International Industrial Union." In an editorial on the Conference (*Socialist*, 27/5/22) they say:—

It has cast a glance at the past and has viewed with disdain its many errors now, and we hope for all times it will never compromise truth to make a friend, and never withhold a blow at error lest it should make an enemy.

Apparently they keep finding themselves out—yet they "keep on doing it!" Where knowledge is lacking, foolish deeds will flourish.

The S.L.P. have decided to support the W.I.I.U., but in the *Socialist* (8/12/21)

the political policy of that organisation was stated as follows:—

By electing a Political Committee whose duty it will be to safeguard and further the interests of the W.I.I.U. in the political field, and who will take instructions from the Branch and report activities at each Branch Meeting.

This surely signifies that another political organisation will exist alongside of the S.L.P. If so, where does the S.L.P. stand? Which of the two bodies is supposed to be correct?—both evidently can't be.

In a Manifesto on the Russian Famine (*Socialist*, 22/9/22), they recommend the starving workers of this country to send "Food, clothing, boots, medicines and locomotives to Russia." Would it be any harm to suggest that "Charity begins at home"? The best way to help the starving Russian workers is to push on the advent of Socialism as rapidly as possible, and not to contribute a few pence to be used by the Co-operative Society, as the S.L.P. suggest. Ironically enough, they were calling upon the workers to contribute to save the S.L.P. Press shortly afterwards!

The following tit-bit is an illustration of S.L.P. logic:—

And economic organisation is a necessary requisite to enforce the aims or wishes as expressed by the political organisation at the ballot box. . . . Organise, therefore, on the political field to capture political power and sweep aside the "robber burg" of Capitalism.—*Socialist*, 8/6/22.

If the "robber-burg" of capitalism has been swept aside, where does the "enforcing" come in? Note the phrase, "aims or wishes." Perhaps the aims differ from the wishes!

ED. COM.

£1,000 FUND.

Already acknowledged	£858 2 9½
By Donations:—		
"J. M. E. (Australia)	5 0 0
Housley	10 0
"J. G."	1 0
Littler	3 8
"W. S. D."	2 0
		5 16 8

By Sale of £1000 Stamps:—		
Book No. 4 "J. R."	5 0
" " 5 "F. A."	2 0
" " 54 (Walthamstow)	1 0 0	
" " 17 "A. B. D."	4 6
		1 11 6

£865 10 11½

A.S.C./22:10:22

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 8 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spicel-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

DEPTFORD.—Sec., J. Veasey, 24, Marlton-st., E. Greenwich, S.E. 10. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays in month, at 8 o'clock, at 485, New Cross-rd., S.E. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.8. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Andrew Porter, 12a, Kings-rd., Portobello.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at The Arcadians, 42, Amburst-rd., Hackney Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 3, Lyveden-rd., Tooting, S.W. 17. Branch meets Fridays, at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 49, Napier rd., Philip Lane, N. 15. Branch meets Fridays, The Trades Hall, 7, Bruce-grove, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E. 17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays each month at 8 p.m., at Alexandra School, N. 22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
 Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
 Manor Park, Earl of Essex, 7.30 p.m.
 Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 a.m.
 Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
 Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
 Walthamstow, Hoe Street Station, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.
 Tottenham, Bruce Grove Station, 8 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No 220. Vol. 19.]

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

SUNLIGHT.

You know, fellow-workers, that we live in a democratic age. The great ones of the earth walk without ceremony amongst men. You have perhaps heard, and in part believed, how the Prince of Wales at the Royal Garden Party did not wear, but merely *carried* his gloves; how the Queen permitted two amateurs to take her photograph, and Prince George laughed at a Punch and Judy show. It may be, too, that at your annual beano you have rubbed shoulders with that aristocracy of wealth which, except at these hallowed seasons, you apprehend but dimly as the beneficent power that feeds, clothes, and shelters you—sometimes; have been privileged to return a respectful answer to a man-to-man query, and to cheer when the gentry departed in its car. But with all this I wonder if you quite realise *how* democratic we have grown? Do you know that several thousands of our brothers in toil, by the scheme of co-partnership which operates at Port Sunlight, are knit with both the plutocracy and the royal family—united in the exalted purpose of serving human need and a pressing need at that—soap! Well, they are.

"The Marquis of Carisbrooke" (the *Star* told us one evening), "eldest son of Princess Beatrice and cousin to the King, has joined the Board of Lever Brothers, Limited. . . . It is not generally known that many members of the Royal Family have very substantial holdings in Lever Brothers." Now then!

See what advantage there is in being born in the era of capitalism. Formerly you might as well have sought admission

to the circle of seraphim as to the royal circle. There *are* records of such things, of course, but the terms were much harder: wounds, hunger, and more than a sporting chance of death. You remember Henry the Fifth's words to his army:

For he to-day that sheds his blood with me shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile, this day shall gentle his condition.

But nowadays, bless you, you have only to get a job at Port Sunlight, and you automatically become a partaker in glory, although, as our friend Uriah would say, "only a very 'umble one."

Oh, the ennobled ones appreciate the honour! Indeed yes; and some other things even more than the honour. For example, there was an enthusiastic meeting in July of the 'umble partners of Lever Bros., to hear presented by Lord Leverhulme a new scheme of benefits intended to be introduced on October 1st. The arrangement, briefly, provides half-pay when there is no work, the same during four weeks of sickness or longer at the discretion of the company, and a free life insurance. And the *Star*, reporting, and rubbing its hands over the excellence of the scheme, declared: "Labour and capital together can produce the means for these and greater benefits if we can once eliminate the theory that they are antagonistic. Pulling together they could make the whole world one huge Port Sunlight."

Be sure they could! One slight alteration will render the *Star* quite correct. For "eliminate the theory" you must read "disguise the fact"; for the theory of the class-war has a way of realising itself in

everyday experience. With this reservation, its truth is evident. Given the present great and potential greater productivity of labour, if the capitalist will only be a little *patient* for his dividends, and the worker will overcome his foolish prejudice against going on half-rations during sickness and slack trade, the thing is done. You can have a docile and industrious proletariat, a rich and unharassed master-class, an absence of trade disputes, a smoothly running industrial machine; in short, an ideal capitalist world—a huge Port Sunlight.

And if that is what you want, fellow-workers, well and good. But—I wonder just *why* you should select for yourselves a life of labour and for your co-partners a life of ease: for yourselves a modest level of comfort and culture, for them the utmost of luxury: for you the cheap cap and the ready-made suit, for them the silk hat and the coronet. In what does Leverhulme or Carisbrooke differ from you? They look much like you; sleeker, perhaps, but not so handsome as many a workman at Port Sunlight. Can they be more brainy than the men who planned the factories and designed the plant? Put them down in the wilderness: could they any better than you preserve and provide for themselves? Only by virtue of one advantage do they enjoy the best of what the partnership produces: they are the *owners* of the factories, of the machines, of the product. Such a collaboration resembles that of the fox and the wolf. You recall the wolf's daily chant? "Red Fox, get me something to eat, or I will eat you." But the fox had an eye to his own interest. When the opportunity came he took it—and good-bye wolf; whereas Lord Leverhulme's scheme, the *Evening Standard* tells us, was "enthusiastically adopted." Ah, but the wolf was less wise than Leverhulme. Instead of "Get me something to eat or I will eat you," he should have said: "Brother fox, little partner, to provide *you* with meals is the first aim of our enterprise. I am the director of it. Feed me well, therefore, that I may the better discharge my beneficent mission." He might then have been able, like Leverhulme, to say: "I have always had the good fortune to be supported."

Here the prince of soap, candles, margarine, fish, and several other things, may

certainly congratulate himself: for without the support of the employees of his many companies, he would stand no higher than they stand themselves. Their support it is that has lifted him above them, placed him in luxury and increased his power. "I was supported," he tells us, "by a sweet lady who consented to be my wife . . . all through her life she supported me. I am now supported by my son and my colleagues on the board."

Excellent, my lord: and you, your amiable wife, your son, and your colleagues (royalty included), have all been supported by whom? . . . The pillars of the glittering edifice are they from whose profitable labour your fortunes are drawn. Fifty years ago you were able to gather your father's whole staff in the room above his grocery shop in Bolton. From that gathering to this at Port Sunlight in July last, your career is a business' romance; and what has been your rôle in it all? You have been the bringer together of human labour power and means of production: you have also been the appropriator of the product. To your employees you have allotted, first, the cost of their keep and reproduction, that you may have a plentiful supply of workers always at call; second, a fraction of your profits, that they may have an interest in keeping them high; and now such provisions as, making away to some extent with the insecurity of their modest livelihood, shall further bind them to you in content and loyalty. The first for your own sake you must do; for the two last the resulting high level of production amply recompenses you. In this you are the type of the far-seeing capitalist.

In so far as you have personally directed your concerns, you have done useful work, you have produced value: but you will not pretend that your fortune represents the value of your services alone. It has been built by the unpaid labour of those whom you employ. The worker may not blame you. So long as we leave the organisation of production in private hands, we can look for no other kind of co-partnership. But we are slowly learning that the "captain of industry" can do nothing which we cannot do better ourselves. A little while now, and "Sceptre and crown will tumble down," and many an immaculate "topper" with them. When that day comes, my lord,

directive genius will be used in the service of the people, and rewarded by the people, not allowed, as yours is to-day, to reward itself. Make the most of your time!

A.

A THOUSAND YEARS HENCE.

"Your party will be all right about a thousand years hence. What the people want is something now, something practical." Thus was I advised by a Labour friend of mine, when discussing the Watford Municipal Election. So that I felt the very least I could do was to suspend my thousand year effort for an evening and go and listen to the people who were "going the same road as myself, but doing something practical on the way." I am glad I went. I will tell you, as nearly as I can recollect, what they said.

The first speaker informed us he was not much good at the "speechifying business," but he hoped to improve in time. We could see by referring to their Election Address that Labour stood for more houses. The housing shortage was a scandal as well as a disgrace. And they wanted lower rents, too. Also more open spaces for the children to play in. And many other things. But above all they wanted everyone's vote next Wednesday. (Applause.) The next practical man hesitatingly informed us that, like the previous speaker, he had not the gift of the gab. He briefly and haltingly read the items in the Address that he and Labour stood for, and assured us before abruptly sitting down, that although (like the previous speaker) he was not much good at the speechifying, he was much better at debate. The third practical man suffered, it seemed (like the previous two speakers), from the defect that he was no good at the oratorical business. But he knew what was wanted. What the town was crying out for was more houses, lower rents and more allotments. He and his wife found that if the end of the week found two shillings in their joint possession, they counted themselves amongst the fortunate. Therefore an allotment was a necessity. It enabled them to live on his meagre earnings. True it took all his spare time, and meant much hard work, but he was prepared to give that. Liked it, in fact. Another thing we wanted was a Municipal Market. The building of this would relieve

the unemployed problem. It would also give the small trader a better chance. It would reduce the cost of living, by making competition keener, a thing that was good for everybody. And so on. Anyhow, don't forget to give us your vote next Wednesday. The next speaker made no apologies. He had the gift of the gab—and very little else. A well-groomed appearance and a hatred of the S.P.G.B. are comprised in the latter. In three sentences he was purple-necked. Someone ("Why doesn't he come and say it to my face?") had described him as a Bolshevik and a disrupter of the British Empire. "If that is repeated in your hearing, gentlemen, tell them that when the call came in 1914, to rally in defence of our rights and liberties, I just took out the old khaki (it had been there twenty-three years, gentlemen) and joined my old unit, and travelled many thousand miles to fight for King and Country." (Loud applause.)

He eventually left this subject and turned to the Housing Question. We were thrilled to learn first, that he also had an allotment, situated in the Public Park. What had this to do with the Housing Problem? Listen. He had been horrified and disgusted, and also ashamed to take his daughter through the park on a Sunday evening, when the grass was dotted in all directions with couples engaged in courtship. The provision of ample housing accommodation would enable these young couples to either get married, or do their courtship in the privacy of their parents' houses. (Loud applause.) After an engaging solo upon the trumpet, entitled "What I have done for you," this fiery revolutionary sat down. The next speaker shared the prevailing epidemic, and was bereft of the gift of the gab. He was, however, in favour of a wider High street. Visions of distracted women with prams, doing their shopping in a High street filled with homicidal motor buses, were held up as good and sufficient justification for giving him our votes next Wednesday. We turned from this harrowing picture to listen to his successor, who regaled us with a list of the Trade Unions, Federations, Councils and Societies of which he was a member. He particularly stressed the fact that he had been a member of the Hearts of Oak for twenty-three years, so that he was eminently *the person* to look after the interests

of friendly society members. Eight women had signed his nomination paper. Who could doubt after that, that here was the man Watford was crying out for. Therefore next Wednesday, etc., etc.!

The last speaker, a thirty years' member of the Ancient Order of Foresters, an old Trade Unionist and a keen Co-operator, told us that the recent incorporation of Watford as a borough was as much the reward of Labour efforts as anyone's. We were told that the immediate results were practically nil, but it was a necessary step towards becoming a County Borough. Arrived at this last dizzy eminence, we were assured that we should be able to have our own policemen and other advantages. The poor old Housing Question was again soundly thrashed, although his plea for more and still more houses seemed rather discounted by the tales he told us of numbers of families being ejected from existing houses because they could not pay the rent.

Yes! I am glad I went. I know what to tell my Labour friend when next we meet. I shall tell him that should ever a doubt arise in my mind of the correctness and stability of the S.P.G.B., one visit to their meeting would restore my faith. If these are the men who are going our way, they have a long way to go to catch up. Most of them have turned into taverns along the wayside, and whilst partaking of very small noggins of "something now," have given up the prospect of attaining something worth having. After listening to an evening of problems and policies and programmes, and after ruminating over previous programmes years and years ago, it is good to sit down and reflect on the crystal clear position of the Socialist Party.

The only thing wrong with the poor is their poverty. They are poor because they are robbed. They are robbed because the rich own the earth and the fulness thereof. The poor have to hire themselves to those who own the means of living. The price of their hiring is called a wage, and is based upon the cost of keeping dusty death at bay. This is their sole share of the wealth they produce. They can alter this state of things whenever they like by taking possession of their means of livelihood. The armed forces would, if possible, prevent them. The armed forces, however, are established, maintained and controlled through Parliament. The

workers elect the Parliament. Therefore, to control the armed forces and to alter the basis of society; to become masters of their means of living, the workers must capture the political machine. If they widen all their High Streets, cover Great Britain from shore to shore with alternating patches of allotments and houses, turn all their towns into boroughs, abolish rates altogether, and achieve all the splintery planks in their Labour programme, they will have "got something now," but they will not achieve Socialism. And until Socialism is attained, the workers will remain poor; poor because they are robbed. Capitalism is based upon the robbery of labour. "Labour" believes in its palliation; Socialism in its abolition. That's all.

PETER QUINCE.

THE MOULDERS OF PUBLIC OPINION.

Observant readers, who are not aware of the forces behind the Press, must have often wondered why the same company will sometimes run Liberal and Tory papers or, more significant still, why the same paper will at one time support one party and at another time support the opponents of that party. An important array of facts and figures explaining these and many other apparently bewildering actions of popular daily and weekly papers, is given in the exceedingly useful pamphlet issued by The Labour Research Department, 162, Buckingham Palace Road, under the terse title of "The Press." Why one set of papers will change with every alteration of the political weathercock—except when they change oftener—while another set remain steadfast to a given policy year in and year out, is explained here in the cold, calculating terms of finance and figures. Altogether this excellent publication, at the price of 6d., is well worth the study of every worker, whether man or woman.

AN ECONOMIC CLASS

is being held at

17, MOUNT PLEASANT, E.C.1.

EVERY THURSDAY EVENING, at 7.30 p.m.

"PLEBS" AND POUNDS.

When the temporary boom that followed the Armistice began to decline, the capitalist class instructed its agents in Press and on platform to give forth "reasons" for prices remaining high in this country, despite the wage reductions that were being enforced in all directions. One of the favourite "reasons" put forward to explain this apparent puzzle was "the inflation of the currency." Tory and Liberal politicians, as well as economists from Cassel to J. A. Hobson, repeated this parrot cry without offering the slightest evidence in support of it.

The Labour Party conducted a so-called investigation into the matter of high prices and borrowed, without examination, the assertion of "inflation," and gave it as one of the chief causes of those high prices.

An article appeared in the July, 1920, *Socialist Standard*, which, among other things, made a brief reference to this point of "inflation." This called forth some correspondence that was dealt with in the September and November, 1920, and April, 1921, issues. The question was raised once again by a correspondent in the June, 1922, *Socialist Standard*, and answered in the same issue.

This answer has evidently upset some of the self-styled experts, as two issues of the "Plebs" Magazine (July and September, 1922) have been forwarded to us, that contain the complaints of certain correspondents about the "Plebs" repeating, parrot-like, the stupid assertion on "inflation."

We have never accused the statesmen of the Labour Party of being guilty of any economic knowledge—Marxian or other—but the "Plebs" claims to be a journal for the spread of Marxian education, and it is the "organ of the National Council of Labour Colleges." If their treatment of this question of "inflation" is a sample of their knowledge, it certainly shows the value of Labour College "education."

In attempting to discuss any question, the first thing to be done is to settle the facts of that question, and then use those facts to build up one's case. In the question under discussion obviously the first point to be settled was "Has there been an inflation of the currency in the United Kingdom?" The inquirer will be aston-

ished to find that neither the Labour Party nor the "Plebs" have made the slightest attempt to examine—let alone settle—this fundamental point. Such is the slovenliness of the "Plebs" in dealing with statements devised to deceive the working class. In these circumstances a brief re-statement of the case will be useful.

The currency of a country consists of the article, or articles, that are chosen by general consent and experience to act as measure of value and medium of exchange. At first this is usually an ordinary commodity that is in general use. When the number and complexity of the exchanges grow to a certain point the need for some guarantee of the invariable quality and weight of the medium of exchange is felt. This duty, sooner or later, devolves upon the Government of each country, and is usually done by stamping the articles concerned with some special device. The stamped article now takes up a new position in the commercial world and is removed from the place of an ordinary commodity to function exclusively as the measure of value, medium of exchange, etc. It thus becomes the currency of that country. Once the main use of a currency is understood the "problems" connected with it will be easily understood.

As the currency is used as a medium of exchange, it is evident that the amount of currency required at any given time will be determined, first by the total of the prices of the commodities exchanged at that time. This quantity of currency will be modified in practice by the amount of credit given by the sellers, which defers payment to some future date; by the number of payments falling due for articles previously sold; and by the speed at which the currency circulates. Thus, if £1 makes 52 moves in a given period—say a year—it will circulate £52 worth of commodities in that time. Cheques, bills of exchange, etc., all add to the factors modifying the quantity of currency required, but these do not alter the main argument. Each country finds by experience the quantity of its own currency required to cover the total of the exchanges and transactions during a given period. This quantity will vary from time to time, particularly in the relative sense, but under normal circumstances these variations are easily met.

Previous to the declaration of war by England upon Germany in 1914, the quantity of currency used in the United Kingdom was £214,000,000. One immediate effect of the declaration of war was a *sudden increase in prices* of numerous commodities. Before any alteration of the currency was considered, let alone carried into effect, this increase of prices made an increase of the currency necessary to carry on business. Every increase in prices since has called either for an increase of currency or for some financial readjustment. In no case has the currency of this country been issued in excess of the business requirements. Yet this simple, glaring fact has been ignored both by the Labour Party and the "Plebs," although it is fundamental to the question under discussion.

The new currency issued took the form, mainly, of Treasury notes. But mark here an extremely significant point. The Act authorising the issue of these notes says:—

(3) The holder of a currency note shall be entitled to obtain on demand, during office hours at the Bank of England, payment for the note at its face value in gold coin which is for the time being legal tender in the United Kingdom.

And this portion of the Act has remained unaltered up to date.

Any student of economics knows that a convertible paper currency cannot be inflated by reason of its convertibility, and this fact alone shows that the statements of the "inflation" mongers are entirely false. But even those who are not students of economics can find proof of the fallacy of "inflation" in another way. That is to compare the increase of prices with the increase in the quantity of the currency. As shown above, an increase of prices, apart from the modifications mentioned, will require an increase of currency. What has happened in this country? According to the Government Report on "Currency Expansion, Price Movements, etc." (Cmd. 734), the following changes in prices and currency have taken place in the United Kingdom. Both prices and currency in 1914 are taken as 100, and the increases on that figure on March, 1920, are given thus:

Currency	Wholesale Prices	Retail Prices of Food
1914 — 100	100	100
1920 — 250	321.8	235

The retail prices of food were under Government control, and thereby prevented

from rising as high as market conditions would otherwise have allowed.

These figures show that so far from any "inflation" having taken place there has actually been a relative *decrease* in the quantity of the currency. Perhaps the quidnuncs of the "Plebs" will try their skill in explaining that little fact? But how do they answer the questions already put to them by their correspondents?

In the first case they say:—

If our comrade would like a summer holiday as the guest of His Majesty she has only to change her £1 currency notes into gold sovereigns, smelt them or sell them by weight for export. If she did succeed in doing this secretly she would find that a gold £1 outside of England bought more than a paper £1. Even inside England she would find people who would give her more than 20s. for it.—(Plebs., July.)

This "answer" is such a sheer evasion of the question that it is difficult to believe it can be other than deliberate. It is on a par with suggesting that an inquirer should commit a burglary in France for the purpose of finding the cause of the fall of the mark in Germany! For, as even the editor of the "Plebs" might know, it has been illegal to melt down currency coins all through the centuries that Coinage Acts have been in existence. Moreover, it is illegal at present to export gold from the United Kingdom without a Government licence. This is also the case in America. But the second statement clinches the position, as it shows that the "Plebs" editor realises he is unable to show any "inflation" in this country and so has to advise his correspondents to go abroad to test the matter. And where in England, may one ask, can more than 20s. be obtained for the £1 Treasury note? Only among illegal thieves and receivers of stolen property. In all the enormous mass of normal trade and commerce of this country the £1 Treasury note will purchase just as much as the gold sovereign. Which is another fact completely disposing of the tale of "inflation" here.

But now a more serious query, of the absurd position of the "Plebs," is sent in, this time from a Social Science class apparently connected with the Labour College.

The tone adopted in the second answer is distinctly different from that used in the first one. A whole class is, seemingly, a more serious proposition from a business point of view than a single reader, though

the same display of ignorance occurs when we are told:—

If enough currency notes were issued then they would exchange precisely on the basis of the socially necessary labour needed to reproduce them.—(Plebs., September, 1922.)

But why are they not exchangeable on that basis now? Immediately because of their convertibility. And once more the correspondent is referred abroad to find out if "inflation" has occurred here!

The answer in the June, 1922, *Socialist Standard* is mentioned, and we are told:—

The *Standard* writer, instead of simply answering a question, recites his little piece about how the S.S. has always denied inflation; and it is his remarks apparently which have worried the Bentley class.—(Ibid.)

The above is not quite correct, for we have not merely denied "inflation" here, we have proved it had no existence. Then follows a paragraph in the "Plebs" admitting almost all our arguments as being correct, though they had denied them by implication previously, but trying to save the wreck of their case by saying:—

But increase in credit and increase in currency react upon each other and it is certainly wrong to deny that inflation of currency was not a factor behind high prices in our own country. The fact that the "Fisher" is convertible does not prevent inflation for it is only convertible in theory.—(Ibid.)

How does the "Plebs" editor know that the Fisher is "only convertible in theory"? He does not say, and for the simplest of reasons; because he has not a tittle of evidence to back his baseless assertions. The reader can be left to judge the value of the "Plebs'" unsupported word when pitted against an Act of Parliament.

Note how the bombastic assurance of the first reply, with its jeering suggestion to the single correspondent to commit a couple of illegal acts to prove an empty assertion, has given way to an admittance that the bulk of our case is correct, and only the weak—nay, childish—remark "it is certainly wrong" to deny "inflation," in the second answer. "Wrong to deny" a statement proved to be false! What logic?

As a matter of fact, it was for those who postulated "inflation" to have given proof of their contention. Not one of them attempted to do so. Instead they merely repeated like parrots the unsupported assertions of the agents of the capitalist class. And as a specimen first of bombastic ignor-

ance and then of a shuffling crawl, the "Plebs'" answers on currency take front rank.

J. FITZGERALD.

NOTE.

Special Meetings will be held at Finsbury Park, Clapham Common, Victoria Park, and West Green Corner, at 11 a.m., on Sunday, Dec. 24th, at which all Comrades and Friends are asked to attend. Ordinary Open-air Propaganda Meetings on this date will be suspended.

£1,000 FUND.

Already acknowledged	£865 10 11½
By Donations:—	
"H. R."	5 0
B. Woan	2 6
Mrs. C.	1 3 8
J. & G. W. U. Organizer ..	1 0 0
"T. F."	4 0
	2 15 2
By Sale of £1000 Stamps:—	
Book No. 24 Wood Green..	2 0
" " 25 Wood Green..	1 6
" " 131 Wood Green..	9 0
" " 133 Wood Green..	2 0
" " 17 West Ham ..	2 0
" " 58 Tottenham ..	2 0
" " 61 Tottenham ..	2 0
" " 11 Tottenham ..	4 0
	1 4 6
Sale of Photos	1 6
	£869 12 1½

A.S.C./21.11.22

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE
S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable. The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 8s. 0d.
Six Months, post free... .. 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

DECEMBER



1922

ELECTION REFLECTIONS.

The General Election is over and, according to the spokesmen of each party, everybody is satisfied—even Lloyd George is reported to have said that the result is as he expected. Curiously enough, in the "Daily Chronicle" (22/11/22) he contends that under proportional representation his group would have done better, and suggests that the question of representation is an important matter that should occupy the new Government. Strange he uttered no word of this in 1918 when a similar thing happened—he waited until it affected him adversely before he said anything on the subject.

The Coalition swept into victory with a large majority in 1918, and now with the swing of the pendulum the Coalition has been swept out of office.

It is the workers who have mainly accomplished this feat. They have done so because they lack the particular knowledge that would enable them to see how hollow are the pretensions of every candidate who put up, and how futile it is, from a working-class standpoint, to change Tweedledum for Tweedledee. As a matter of fact, the same party (Conservative) that had a majority in the last Parliament has the majority in the new, but they have now knocked the word "Coalition", out of their title—

that is the essential difference! As we pointed out in our election manifesto, the change of Government was an excuse to make certain changes of policy more suitable to the Imperialists who control affairs.

According to the returns over 13,000,000 people voted in this election; that is, over 3,000,000 more than in 1918.

As in 1918, so now—the Liberals endeavour to cover their sweeping defeat by claiming that under proportional representation their figures would have been higher. There is no guarantee that such would be the case, as under proportional representation all parties would be represented in each constituency, which might alter the whole complexion of affairs in almost any direction. There was no Socialist candidate put forward in this election, but still, as in 1918, we can claim some consolation prizes.

For example: Dundee has given Winston the noble order of the boot. In 1919 C. B. Stanton was hoping for "the resumption of the pre-war Royal Garden Parties where their Majesties met members of the House of Commons." Now, alas! his luck was out and so is he (although he ran as a Liberal against Labour)—no more Royal Garden Parties for him for awhile.

Havelock Wilson is another "failure," as South Shields turned him down. Colonel Claude Lowther, some time Chairman of the Anti-Socialist Union, got less than a third of the votes at Carlisle and also failed to get in.

Lieut.-Col. John Ward and the Rt. Hon. G. H. Roberts have risen to the distinguished position of running as Liberals against their former Labour associates.

That celebrated strike seller, emigration and military tout, Ben Tillet, squeezed in by a majority of 19 (a minority of the total poll) at Salford, and a chip of the same block, Dan Irving, "worked the oracle" again at Burnley. Bill Thorne also turns up once more.

The voting in the elections was roughly as follows:—

Conservatives	5,500,000
Liberals	4,000,000
Labour	4,250,000
Other Parties	400,000 odd

In other words, 13½ million people voted against Socialism the other day in this country, and many hundred thousands were too indifferent and apathetic to vote at all! And yet there are people who lately waited

on the tiptoe of expectancy for revolution to stalk abroad in the land at any moment.

The Labour Party is jubilant over their large return of 142 members. How was it obtained? A glance at the list of members returned on the Labour programme reveals how very respectable the Labour Party has become. K.C.s, Rt. Hons., clergymen, Army officers, doctors, and other professional place hunters, together with landowners and successful business men, figure in the list.

The entrance of the lawyers is highly significant. They are usually found where there is a promise of plums, and their support of the Labour Party's policy suggests that this policy promises to be fruitful—with a particular brand of plums!

It is worth noting, in passing, that over fifty Labour candidates were returned by a minority of the poll in three-cornered contests, so that the majority of their constituents are not in favour of such candidates. It is also worthy of note that Labour candidates received a considerable amount of Liberal support. The "Daily News" advised its supporters to vote Labour where there was no Independent Liberal, and backed in particular such candidates as H. Gosling, Emil Davies, and Holford Knight. A further point is that in this election the Labour Party put forward far more candidates than ever before.

When these points are weighed along with the increased vote at the election, and the nondescript nature of the Labour candidates, it takes some of the edge off "Labour's Victory."

The Liberals find such a similarity of outlook between themselves and the Labour Party that they can forget their own wounds in rejoicing over the "success" of Labour. For instance:—

There will undoubtedly be a real Parliamentary Opposition in the new House, for both Labour and the Liberals have secured the return of many of those leaders whose exclusion robbed the last House of distinction.—*Daily News*, 17/11/22.

These "leaders" who have returned to adorn the House of Commons include Ramsay Macdonald (who supported the War) and Philip Snowden (who justified the use of military in strikes).

The Labour Party were determined to have these "adornments" replaced, so they scoured the country for "safe" constituencies. Blackburn, Leicester, and Wool-

wich were cold-shouldered and Glamorgan and Colne Valley "honoured" by the choice. The "New Leader" (17/11/22) states: "My first day in Colne Valley convinced me that here Philip Snowden had found the right constituency." Yet although Snowden and Macdonald were returned in each case, they only succeeded in obtaining a minority of the poll. Further down the author of the above quotation makes the following illuminating statement: "I had the relative satisfaction, in the absence of any Labour candidate, of voting for a Liberal woman who opposed two particularly unsympathetic Tories." The dear, sympathetic fellow! This further illustrates how short is the step between Labour and Liberal.

Finally the "Observer" (19/11/22) very shrewdly summed up the position as follows:—

In summary, it may be said that the Labour Party has at last become national as distinct from class. And one may sleep comfortably in one's bed because the moderate reformers enormously outnumber those who would raze the social structure to its foundations.

The "Observer" is quite correct. The capitalist class have little to fear and the working class little to gain by the return of the "Labour men"; the past records of many of them are convincing enough on this point.

There is one important fact, however, to which we must draw attention in connection with the large "Labour" poll. The Labour Party put forward over 400 candidates, out of which 142 were elected. Of the number elected 72 were for seats gained. A glance over the list of places where seats have been gained would reveal the fact that they are just those places where a strong industrialist propaganda (propaganda against participation in Parliament) has been carried on, and where the disastrous effects of "direct action" have been experienced. For example: Aberavon, Merthyr Tydvil (2), Swansea, Neath, Abertillery—all in the South Wales coal area, the beloved "red" area of the Communists. In Durham, out of 11 constituencies the Labour Party gained 7, held 3, and lost 1! Accrington, Newcastle, Rutherglen (Lanark), Wallsend, and Whitehaven are other illustrations of Labour gains in coal areas.

Taking these facts along with the further

fact that over 70 per cent. of those on the register voted, some idea will be obtained of how the pendulum is swung back from "direct action" to constitutional action.

In the case of W. Adamson, G. H. Hirst, G. Barker and T. W. Grundy, the other parties combined to make them a present of their seats. This is particularly significant in the case of G. Barker (a pet of the Communists and Plebs leaders), who played a part in the miners' betrayal last year.

The Communists put up two candidates (W. Gallagher and J. T. Walton Newbold) officially, two others were put up in disguise (J. Vaughan and Walter Windsor), one was put up by the unemployed, of which they did not hear until afterwards (Geddes), and they backed another (S. Saklatvala), who was not a member of their Party. It will be interesting to observe the "State machinery smashing efforts" of their only successful candidate, Walton Newbold.

"WHAT WE WANT AND WHY."

The above is the title of an attempt on the part of six leading lights of the Trade Union world to hide their lack of any common definite object, save that of misleading the workers from the road to emancipation. We are obliged to tell the publishers* frankly that they have issued a rather expensive 7s. 6d. article. None of the contributors are particularly clear as to what they want, while as to why they want it, they are vaguer still.

The ambitions of Mr. J. H. Thomas would, apparently, be satisfied with an efficient railway service, to be secured, presumably, by "nationalisation." He is very keen on convincing his readers that he is not out for "aggression." "Peace and economy" are his watchwords. The interests of the railway servants take second place with him, even if they can be said to have a place at all. He shows the waste going on under such relics of the competitive system as exist, but fails to show how the elimination of that waste would assist the employee; and keeps dark the fact that economy under capitalism simply means getting the same amount of work done with fewer men. The concentration of the railways in the hands of a capitalist State is only a means to the accomplishment of that

* Collins.

end. For this reason it is somewhat difficult to follow Mr. Thomas when he asserts that, "with State ownership we could see a possibility of improving the general condition of the worker" (p. 17). As he himself points out (p. 24), where State ownership exists, as in several countries on the Continent, the chief beneficiaries are the business firms who obtain concessions.

Mr. Thomas attaches very great importance to the machinery of conciliation between the workers and the bosses, yet on page 26 we are told that "no machinery can have the slightest value unless it is operated with good-will on the part of both interests." Why should good-will obtain between parties whose interests are diametrically opposed to one another? To that question Mr. Thomas provides no answer.

He shows that the workers by strict observance of the companies' rules could practically "stop the service" (p. 28), but "I should personally never favour such action." He leaves it to his colleague Bromley to point out that the companies are not so squeamish. They have no hesitation in using their rules to send a man to prison if it suits their purpose (p. 176). It is the old story. The workers are advised to be peaceful and to leave their case to their leaders what time the bosses do as they like. And this is the gentleman who poses, and is accepted by the workers, as their champion!

Robert Williams, of the Transport Workers' Federation, would have us believe that he is a Socialist, yet does not condescend in the space afforded by fifty pages to give us a clear definition of Socialism, nor any hint as to how it is to be brought about. He appears to be much more concerned to excuse and justify the treacherous activity of the leaders of the Triple Alliance, on the ground of trade depression and increasing unemployment. Although the workers were organised in much greater numbers than ever before, and he admits that the need for militancy was just as great as it ever had been, he pretends that the rout has been nothing more than an inevitable retreat carried out in an orderly manner. He fails to show that the real cause of the trouble has been the lack of understanding and mental solidarity on the part of the workers themselves; for which

he, Robert Williams, and his colleagues are, in view of their opportunities, largely responsible by default. Williams advances some timid criticism of the Labour Party's association with the Coalition during the war, and attributes their defeat at the General Election (1918) to this cause. The logical process by which he arrives at this conclusion is somewhat obscure. In any case, the Labour Party's policy from the date of its inception has never been guided by any intelligible principle, so that Mr. Williams has only himself to blame if he has been disappointed in it. If he really wanted Socialism he would abandon the Labour Party to its inevitable fate, dishonour and disruption!

Tom Mann, in "The Case for the Engineers," provides a little variety, inasmuch as he makes some pretence at analysing the existing order and offering an alternative; yet here, again, the alternative is not defined with any degree of clarity. "Economic change" is mentioned, but its precise character is not stated; while as to the means whereby it is to be accomplished, we are referred vaguely to "industrial action."

"The Politicians," by whom, presumably, Mann means the Labour Party, are superficially criticised. Their faith in Parliament and constitutional methods is attacked, but their political treachery and duplicity are not mentioned. Mann appears to be utterly oblivious of the fact that Parliament controls the armed forces of the nation and is not likely to stand meekly by while the "men in the workshop" do as they like. The political machine is the only means whereby the workers can give public and effective expression to any common aim and purpose which they may develop as a class. For that reason the Socialist advocates its use. To leave it in the hands of the masters is sheer criminal stupidity!

Coming back to the engineers, Mann endeavours to illustrate the power of industrial action by instancing the hopelessness of asking for a rise in wages from Parliament. He fails to see that the same workers who are asking for a rise have sent their enemies to the seat of government. Are people in such a mental condition ready to emancipate themselves by any action, industrial or otherwise? Further, how can struggles on the industrial field over wages, hours, etc., lead to freedom from wage-

slavery? Mann appears to hold that the industrial organisations will gradually assume control of the workshops and pay all wages, etc. Are the masters, therefore, going to surrender their profits. And, if not, what advantage will the worker obtain by drawing the price of slavery through his branch secretary?

Real control centres in the possession of the means of production, and the fight for that possession must take the form of political action. Capitalist property will exist just so long as the capitalist class are left in control of forces which protect that property.

Mr. Noah Ablett illustrates from details of his own experiences the destructive conditions under which the miners toil. When, however, he deals with remedies he becomes extremely confused. He condemns private ownership on account of the antagonism of interests which it involves, and yet advocates a programme of reforms which will become meaningless as soon as private ownership is dispensed with. One is thus driven to the conclusion that by the elimination of private ownership he simply means "nationalisation," which, for reasons already stated, can offer no gain to the workers. In order to make this clearer, let us proceed to Mr. Bromley's article.

Mr. Bromley covers much the same ground as J. H. Thomas, but gives a more definite description of what "nationalisation" amounts to. On pages 186-7 we read, "two unions, very carefully drafted a Bill for the complete nationalisation of the railways. . . . It proposes the purchase of railways stocks and shares through the medium of Government Stock . . . charged on the State railway undertaking and the Consolidated Fund, which shall bear such a rate of interest as would enable it at the time of issue to be realised at par." Thus "nationalisation" simply transforms the capitalists concerned from shareholders in a private concern into Government Stock holders still living on the workers by means of the rate of interest!

Mrs. P. Snowden deals with the competition existing between the sexes in the working class. Her "ultimate ideal" is the "payment for work, irrespective of sex, of such a wage as no man or woman would be afraid or ashamed to accept" (p. 214). Albeit, she has previously pointed out that the existing "industrial system does not

scruple to play off women against men in attempts to lessen the costs of production by reducing the wages bill" (p. 212). She wants the capitalist system minus one of its principal and essential features, the subsistence level of wages. Curiously enough, on page 261, discussing the necessity of finding work for an ever-increasing number of women, she says that "This can only be done satisfactorily when the social system of the present has given place to a new order, in which all the instruments of labour are in the hands of the community as a whole." The force and significance of this admission do not appear to strike her, however, as she proceeds on the next page to propose all sorts of ameliorations in the worker's lot without the slightest hint as to how they are to be accomplished. Further, she advocates the technical education of women and girls, apparently blind to the fact that hundreds of technically trained men are at the present moment searching in vain for a purchaser of their labour power. She fails to point out that the women, no less than the men, of the working class need to realise that they are slaves. This is the essential preliminary to any improvement.

So long as the capitalist class control the means of life, every economy and every improvement in the education, health, and technical ability of the workers, male and female, only results in their becoming more productive slaves. The fruits of their increased productivity go to the masters and not to themselves. This is the central fact ignored or obscured by these so-called leaders of labour.

Whether the workers follow the Labour Party "to nationalisation" plus reforms, or the Industrialist leaders to "workshop control" plus reforms, they are doomed to disappointment. The only road to emancipation is the conversion of the means of life into the property of the whole people. To this end we call upon the workers to organise consciously, and politically for the capture of the machinery of government.

Socialism, undiluted and unadulterated, is what the Socialist Party wants. As to why we want it, only look around you. Millions of willing producers are compelled to be idle while they need food, clothing, housing, etc., and the means exist ready to hand whereby they can produce them! Generations of workers have put their faith in

legislative reforms and strikes, but we are as far away as ever from economic security.

The Social Revolution offers the only way out. Muster, then, under our banner, with a view to its speedy accomplishment.

E. B.

CHRISTMAS SHOPS.

In England Christmas is our one surviving festival. Others have fallen into neglect as we have left behind the manner of social life in which they flourished. Christmas lives, despite the passing of its religious significance, because humanly it is as dear to men of the twentieth century as to those who, five hundred years ago, brought in the boar's head with ceremony and rejoicing. While people love to play as well as work, to practise hospitality, to remember and be remembered of friends, so long will Christmas or something like it be set in our calendar.

When November was scarcely half spent, the shops began to make their special display. Now as I write, the wares of the world are heaped behind the shining windows. Like so many Aladdin's caves, they will yield their store to him who has the golden key: to all others the frail glass pane is a barrier impassable.

And who are they that can command the best and largest share? Those who took no part in producing it. Is there not something strange, comrades, in this? Alaskan furs, Chinese silks, ivories of Japan, Sheffield cutlery, Spanish, Arabian and Tasmanian fruits, do not create and convey themselves, even at Christmas time. That which shaped, transported and arranged them was your work, and that of your fellows in all corners of the earth.

These goods and the posters that advertise them, the factories where they were made and the machines within the factories, the engines and ships that carried them here—you made them all. Yet your part in the season's celebrations is to watch more fortunate folks enjoy them, and feel your own needs more bitterly in the face of inaccessible plenty. You who have distant friends and families—why cannot you visit them? You fathers and mothers of children, do not even their small delights mean the sacrifice of something necessary to yourselves? There are young men and girls among you

who dreamed of homes of your own; and this winter finds you further off than ever from your desire. Was there ever a situation so topsy-turvy? Would you credit, if you did not know by grim experience, that having done so much, you should stand outside the windows, and those who made nothing in their lives should go in and buy? Wouldn't it sound like a crazy tale? In a sane order of life, would not the very contrary be the reality—the idle without and the workers within? Add to this that the idle are maided and valeted, driven about, entertained and guarded by you, and surely you and they appear as characters in a tragic farce! If a crowning absurdity were lacking, it is supplied by the presence of multitudes who are not even *allowed* to work. The strength and skill that could provide anew, even after the spoilers had helped themselves, must remain locked in their shoulders and fingers, wasted and wanting.

What is the explanation of it all? You know before I tell you. It is that this wealth of good things is not here for the purpose of satisfying human needs. It is here because its production and sale *pays someone*. The very toys, naïve and roguish things as they are, were born to serve this all-important end of profit. That is the way you allow the business of production to be arranged. What does it matter to the corn broker and the wool dealer that you need food and clothes? The question is, Have you the means to buy? And if your wife would look lovely in a silken dress, how does that concern the silk importer or the modiste? Your whole livelihood is what you can get by selling your strength and skill. And since the corn, wool, or silk merchant (or whichever other of their class employs you) purchases them for just as much as will keep you alive and moderately fit, you never will enjoy more than a mean living—so long as you serve a master.

Are you satisfied? Perhaps you would have matters no otherwise. I said you allow the present arrangement. Do you know, comrades, that is absolutely true? That you can change matters whenever you determine? Look boldly and searchingly at the men who exploit you. It is they who depend on you, not you on them. Without your lifelong service they would cut sorrier figures than you, waiting your

turn at the Labour Exchange. What has bewitched you, that you allow yourselves to be shorn? I think I know the lie that keeps you hopeless. It is as old as the relation between oppressor and oppressed, and it runs: "Thus things have always been." And your lifetime is too short and too full of care for you to learn that it is a lie. Have done with it now. Lift your heads and take a look back—and forward. There was a time when this class that now sits on your shoulders was fighting to throw off its own Old Man of the Sea, and was denounced by the Old Man—the nobility—just as it denounces your spasmodic struggles. It was resisted, as it means to resist you, but it won, and its victory was not accidental. It won because it commanded and could develop something which the feudal land-owners could not: the labour power of a proletariat—people like you and me, who have no property and must find employment in order to live. This new productive force, our labour, was an infant then; to-day a giant, too big for our masters to manage. We can produce far more than they can sell. Now *we* arise and resolve that capitalists with their "private enterprise" must *give way* in their turn to us. We do not fight at hazard either. Our victory also is sure, because we control a new force. We can develop what the lords of capital cannot: our own labour power, the labour power of co-operatively associated men and women. Isn't this a destiny worth fulfilling? Determine that next Christmas shall not find you spreading the feast for others and stealing humbly into the shadows to famish and grieve. Thirty years ago William Morris demanded:

Why, then, and for what are we waiting? There are three words to speak; *we will it*; and what is the foe, but the dream-strong wakened and weak?

Now our masters no longer even dream that they are secure. You have shaken their rest by the noise of your discontent, never yet articulate nor united enough to be very dangerous, but loud enough to prevent their ever sleeping again. They listen for the word you will presently say: "We have no more use for masters. We declare the land on which we labour and the instruments we use, to be ours; and every man who would share the common wealth must also share the necessary work, were he fifty times an Inchcape or a Coats!"

Then, when Christmas morning brightens on a world possessed by the workers, the day will be a festival indeed.

A.

REVIEWS.

"MILITARY PREPARATIONS FOR THE GREAT WAR," by E. D. MOREL. Price 6d. Labour Publishing Co., Ltd.

This is a useful restatement of the facts and figures relating to amounts of money spent by the Great Powers on preparation for war from 1905 onwards.

Most of these figures and criticisms were published in a previous pamphlet entitled *Truth and the War*, but it is well to put those facts forward again on account of the bearing they will have on the formation of opinion on the Reparations question. One quotation will be sufficient to show the kind of material Mr. Morel handles. On page 21 he states:—

But the most astounding fact which French publications reveal is that when the war broke out the French Army alone was numerically as strong as the German! (Italics in original.)

It is a pity that so useful a collection of facts and figures, not easily accessible to the workers, could not be published at a cheaper price. Sixpence for a 30 page pamphlet looks a lot to the wage worker.

"WILL THE BOLSHEVIKS MAINTAIN POWER," by N. LENIN. Price 1s. 6d. Labour Publishing Co., Ltd.

The above is an article written by Lenin in October, 1917, in answer to the claim of the opponents of Bolshevism that the Bolsheviks "would not attempt to take complete power on their own initiative."

Though written so long ago, this appears to be its first publication in English. Lenin's reply rebuts the claim of his opponents, in his usual vigorous fashion, and the fact that five years later the Bolsheviks are still ruling in Russia justifies the position he then took up.

In this article Lenin makes the claim, often repeated afterwards, but now definitely refuted by the publication of the Russian Soviet Constitution, that the Soviet system is superior to the political system of the Western world:—

In comparison with bourgeois parliamentarism it is a step forward in the development of

democracy which has a historical world significance—P. 43 (Italics ours.)

The absurdity of this claim has been fully exposed in the *Socialist Standard*, July, 1920; while deference to democracy is now treated by the Bolsheviks and their supporters as "an out-of-date shibboleth," "a bourgeois notion," etc.

Another piece of evidence supplied by this article is on the view held by Lenin and his party at the time of the Revolution, that the workers of the Western world were practically ready for the social Revolution. On page 101 he says:—

It [the Russian Revolution] will conquer the whole world, for in all countries the Socialist transformation is ripening.

It is our great regret that even now, let alone then, the mass of the workers are so far from the mental development necessary for the Socialist Revolution.

HAVE WE SOCIALISATION?

To the Editorial Committee of the *Socialist Standard*.

Comrades,

An article appearing in this month's *Socialist Standard* over the initials J. D., entitled "Remedies," needs your careful attention; an otherwise admirable article is marred in its conclusion by the astounding statement that the remedy for unemployment, poverty and overwork suffered by the working class is the socialisation of the means of production and distribution. Since how long has the socialisation of those means been the one remedy for the above-mentioned social evils, poverty, etc.? Seeing that capitalism and its mode of production has long since achieved the aforesaid socialisation of the means of production and distribution, what is there to trouble about; and why, like other journals still working for this end, such as *Justice*, *Labour Leader*, *Socialist*, continue to agitate and advocate and waste time over bringing about what is already accomplished? It is better to be exact than misleading in our teaching, and if J. D. and yourselves will show in our next or some succeeding number of the *Socialist Standard* that the only remedy for poverty, unemployment and overwork lays in the direction of social ownership and democratic control of the means of producing and dis-

tributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community, you will have done what is necessary so far as the article needs correction; and in the interest of truth, and of the hitherto good name of the *Socialist Standard*, I trust you will see the necessity of giving the correction as prominent a place as the statement that caused me to write you.

Yours fraternally,

HY. MARTIN.

P.S.—The exactness I mean is not in the metaphysical sense.

REPLY.

Mr. Martin has discovered a mare's nest. The means of production are socially operated because the laws, methods of management, and the interaction of the various members of society who take part in wealth production, are all adapted to serve the present economic system.

But both the means of production and the products are privately owned. Hence there does not exist the Socialisation—or the making into a social system—of the means of production and distribution. This can only exist when social operations are combined with social ownership of both means and results of production. In other words, when Socialism is established.

ED. COM.

AN INVITATION

will be given to Subscribers to the £1000 Fund, (minimum subscription, 1/-) to a

SELECT DANCE

TO BE HELD AT

THE TOWN HALL,
MARE STREET, HACKNEY,

On Saturday, December 30th, 1922.

Doors open 7 o'clock Dancing 7.30 p.m.

Further particulars can be obtained from the SECRETARY, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1, or from any of the local branches (for addresses see back page), who will also be open to receive subscriptions.

A "ROYAL" SOLUTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT.

The Prince, like many other people, is seriously concerned at the unemployment question and the distinctly gloomy outlook for the winter, and has studied recent official statistics on this closely during the past few weeks.—*Daily News*, 15/9/22.

Economies are being made at the Royal Mews. The team of black horses which draws the King's coach on State occasions, and was substituted for the famous but expensive cream horses, is to be dispensed with. A number of men will go at the same time.—*Daily News*, same page, same date.

We wonder if this "number" was included in the "recent statistics" studied by the Prince, or will they be the subject of future study—say about two years after the discharged men have starved to death?

BOOKS RECEIVED.

"What we Want and Why." Mrs Philip Snowden, J. H. Thomas, Robert Williams, Tom Mann, J. Bromley, Noah Ablett, Collins. 7/6 net.

"A Text Book of Economics." M. Briggs, M.A., Camb., B.Sc. (Econ.), London.

"Economic History of England." M. Briggs, M.A., Camb., B.Sc. (Econ.), London.

"Thinking." Fred Casey. Labour Publishing Company.

A Lecture on

SOCIALISM, And How to Get It,

will be given at

BROMLEY PUBLIC HALL,
Bow Road, E.,

ON

Sunday, 24th December, 1922

at 7.30 p.m.

Admission Free.

Questions & Discussion

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS. Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spiceal-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

DEPTFORD.—Sec., J. Veasey, 24, Marlton-st., E. Greenwich, S.E. 10. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays in month, at 8 o'clock, at 435, New Cross-rd., S.E. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.8. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Andrew Porter, 12a, Kings-rd., Portobello.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at The Arcadians, 42, Amhurst-rd., Hackney Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 3, Lyveden-rd., Tooting, S.W. 17. Branch meets Fridays, at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 49, Napier rd., Philip Lane, N. 15. Branch meets Fridays, The Trades Hall, 7, Bruce-grove, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E. 17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays each month at 8 p.m., at Alexandra School, N. 22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Manor Park, Earl of Essex, 7.30 p.m.
Tooting Broadway, Garratt-lane, 11.30 a.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
Walthamstow, Hoe Street Station, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.
Tottenham, Bruce Grove Station, 8 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.